c.10

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
SUOS CULTORES SCIENTIA CORONAT
FOUNDED A.D. 1870

LIBRARY

Withdrawn from
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

BY PAUL VAN DYKE

THE STORY OF FRANCE

IGNATIUS LOYOLA

CATHERINE DE MEDICIS. Two Volumes

RENASCENCE PORTRAITS

THE AGE OF THE RENASCENCE

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

THE STORY OF FRANCE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/storyoffrance0000paul

THE STORY OF FRANCE

FROM JULIUS CÆSAR TO NAPOLEON III

BY

PAUL VAN DYKE

FORMERLY PYNE PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

NEW YORK · LONDON

1929

CARNEGIE LIBRARY
LIVINGSTONE COLLEGE
SALISBURY, N. C. 28144

Copyright, 1928, by
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Printed in the United States of America

V288

I DEDICATE THIS BOOK TO

MY BROTHER HENRY

AUTHOR OF THE FOLLOWING VERSE OF A POEM ENTITLED "THE NAME OF FRANCE":

Give us a name to fill the mind
With the shining thoughts that lead mankind,
The glory of learning, the joy of art,—
A name that tells of a splendid part
In the long, long toil and the strenuous fight
Of the human race to win its way
From the feudal darkness into the day
Of Freedom, Brotherhood, Equal Right,—
A name like a star, a name of light.
I give you France!

215445

624427

PREFACE

This book is for those readers who may want a sketch of French history which is neither a summary crammed with names and dates, nor a vague record of the writer's reactions to facts his reader is not told, but rather a suggestion, as definite as brevity permits, of what France has suffered, gained and done in 2,000 years.

Its author loves America supremely and he has also a great affection and admiration for France, among whose people he has spent, in archival studies for his life of Catherine de Médicis, in war service and in the peace service of the American University Union, six of the last fifteen years of his life. He has done his best to apply to this little book such experience in clear and condensed presentation of essential facts as he may have gained in thirty-three years trying to teach history and such trained habits of impartial truth-telling as may have resulted from long and laborious attempts to write biography.

He has tried to do what the dying Othello asked his friends to do in their letters:

> "Speak of me as I am, nothing extenuate,
> Nor set down aught in malice."

For the true story of a nation, like the true story of a man, can only be suggested out of a habit of impartial truth-telling, joined to a sympathetic understanding. Both truth and understanding have led me to call attention to the repeated times when France has been a leader in the paths of progress and have made me remind the reader of the great contributions France has made to the common treasure of mankind.

The book is based mainly on standard works which historians classify under the technical term secondary sources. But I have tried to make the narrative more vivid by citing, in each epoch, at least some passages (mainly chosen from my own direct reading) written by men who lived in that epoch. My chief guide has been the twenty-five volumes of the *Histoire de France*, edited in two parts by Ernest Lavisse and written by a score of distinguished French scholars. I have also made much use in some places of the *Histoire de la Nation Française*, fifteen volumes edited by Gabriel Hanotaux, and of the *Histoire de la Literature Française* of Gustave Lanson. In addition, I have consulted some hundred and eighty odd volumes, taking whatever seemed fit for my purpose. References are unnecessary in a book of this sort, but in the case of dogmatic assertions which I would not have the authority to make, I have named the author.

An attentive reader may remark that appreciations of the value of French contributions to the common treasure of mankind are, in nearly every instance, cited from authorities who are not Frenchmen.

I am under obligations to my colleagues Professors Munro and Armstrong for suggestions in regard to the crusades, feudalism, and the development of the French language, and to my younger colleagues Professors David Magie, Chapman, Levengood, Friend and Stohlman for critical suggestions in various parts of my work.

A very condensed analysis of this attempt to tell the story of France.

Prologue: The Pleasant Land of France.

1. *The Civilization of the Mediterranean Spreads Over France.*
   60 B. C. to 400 A. D. Chapters II to IV.
2. *The Flood of Northern Barbarism.*
   400 to 814. Chapters V and VI.
3. *Triumphant Barbarism Followed by Feudalism.*
   814 to 1108. Chapters VII to IX.
4. *The Rise of French Civilization.*
   1108 to 1226. Chapters X to XV.
5. *The King the Centre of France.*
   1226 to 1328. Chapters XVI to XVIII.
6. *The Great Misery. The Triumph of the Crown.*
   1328 to 1483. Chapters XIX to XXIII.
7. *The Great Upheaval of the Sixteenth Century.*
   Chapters XXIV to XXXI.
8. *Absolutism Becomes a Vital Element of France.*
   1598 to 1715. Chapters XXXII to XL.
9. *The Breakdown of Absolutism.*
   1715 to 1789. Chapters XLI to XLIV.
10. *Three Generations of Unstable Equilibrium.*
    1789 to 1875. Chapters XLV to L.

Epilogue: The Steadfast Republic.

A table of contents follows.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	Prologue. The Pleasant Land of France . .	3
II.	Preroman Gaul. The Roman Conquest . . .	9
III.	The Empire Slowly Absorbs Gaul. The Anarchy and Decadence of the Empire	19
IV.	What Rome Did for Gaul	29
V.	Barbarism Spreads. Clovis the Powerful Barbarian and His Family	41
VI.	Charlemagne Tries to Restore the Roman State	50
VII.	The Decay of the Empire of Charlemagne . .	63
VIII.	Feudalism Follows Anarchy as a Solvent of the State	67
IX.	Signs of Energy Fit to Make a New Civilization. Romanesque Architecture — Scholasticism — The Crusades	84
X.	The Formation of the Monarchy (1108–1223) .	99
XI.	Philip Augustus and Why He Deserved His Name. The Southern Heretics	110
XII.	The Soul of France Finds Expression. Gothic Architecture. The University of Paris . .	119
XIII.	French Poetry. The Song of Roland. The Troubadours. The Romances. Nicolette. Influence of French Thought and Skill . . .	128
XIV.	Popularizing Learned Books. The Theatre. The Fabliaux	145

CHAPTER PAGE

XV. Social Creations. The Friars. Chivalry. The Good and Evil of the Age 151

XVI. Saint Louis the Incarnation of the Kingly Ideal 163

XVII. The French People Back the Crown Against Boniface VIII 169

XVIII. A Century of Development in Government and Literature 178

XIX. The Hundred Years War. Etienne Marcel, the Champion of Urban Liberty . . . 187

XX. Kings Wise and Foolish. Joan of Arc . . 200

XXI. The Great Misery. French Courage. The Babylonian Captivity. Gallicanism. The Nobility of the Robe 214

XXII. Art and Letters Survive Misery (1328–1453) 225

XXIII. Louis XI Consolidates France 233

XXIV. Why France Was Not the Leader of the Renascence. The Obsession of Italian Conquest. The Dynastic Duel 245

XXV. The Renascence in France. The Early French Reformers 257

XXVI. The Spread of the Calvinist Church in France 272

XXVII. The Huguenots and the Orthodox Fight in the Name of Christ 284

XXVIII. The Backbone of the Huguenot Armies. The King's Mother and Coligny Become Rivals for the Ear of the King 292

XXIX. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The Politique Party Believes that Only Tolerance Can Bring Peace 297

CHAPTER PAGE

XXX. The League of the Holy Trinity. Henry IV Saves France 303

XXXI. Literature in the Sixteenth Century. Rabelais. Calvin. Montaigne 309

XXXII. Absolutism Begins to Be a Vital Element of France. Henry IV 327

XXXIII. Richelieu, the Uncrowned Ruler of France. The Revival of Religion. The Press. The Salon. The Academy 335

XXXIV. Mazarin, the Crafty Italian Who Ruled France Nineteen Years 349

XXXV. Louis XIV. The Economic Plans of Colbert 357

XXXVI. Colbert's Use of Art and Letters. The King's Mistresses and Extravagance 367

XXXVII. The Wars of Louis XIV 373

XXXVIII. The Statecraft of Louis XIV. The Warning of Fénelon. La Bruyère. La Fontaine . 381

XXXIX. The Religious Policy of Louis XIV. Jansenists. Calvinists. Pascal 392

XL. The Glory of French Literature. Corneille, Racine, Molière 400

XLI. The Regent Who Used Power Badly. Louis XV Who Used It Not at All. The Permanent Tasks of Government 411

XLII. The Reign of Louis XVI, Who Would Have Been an Excellent Locksmith. Turgot. Necker. French Aid to America . . . 423

XLIII. The Causes of the Revolution. The Constitutional Monarchy 433

CHAPTER		PAGE
XLIV.	The New France. The Fall of the Monarchy	442
XLV.	The Republic and Her Enemies. The Bloody Political Intolerance of the Terror . .	455
XLVI.	The Reaction. General Bonaparte Defends the Directory. Religion Revives. Wisdom in Government	470
XLVII.	The Directory. Its Overthrow by Bonaparte and His Friends	476
XLVIII.	Napoleon	485
XLIX.	The Re-established Kings and the Two Revolutions They Provoked. France the Torch-Bearer for Liberal Europe	495
L.	The Second Republic. The Second Empire .	503
LI.	Epilogue. The Steadfast Republic . . .	515
	Index	527

THE STORY OF FRANCE

CHAPTER I

PROLOGUE. THE PLEASANT LAND OF FRANCE

The French know better how to live than anybody else: which means that the average Frenchman gets more satisfaction and pleasure out of his seventy years in this world than the average citizen of any other nation. The fundamental reason for this is that he is a contented creature with a natural fund of gaiety and a love of beauty, and these qualities seem like a reflection from his fair and fertile country. The French landscape is filled with beauty, and even those parts of it which lack beauty have a homely and familiar charm which seems to invite to a gay and gentle placidity in living. The first word of affection applied to France in the earliest great work of French literature is *la douce France:* the sweet, gentle, kindly France.

The reaction of this environment on such a temperament has been to produce a nation singularly lovable to those who know them well. At the beginning of the eighteenth century Addison in his notes on his European travels wrote: "The French have always an open, easy, affable air about them and it is part of their ideal to display a certain gaiety and vivacity." Towards the end of the century a Scotch physician, whose letters on his continental travels were extremely popular, wrote: "The French nation seems to me extraordinarily brave, essentially good and without exception the most amiable in Europe. Politeness and good manners may be traced through every rank from the highest nobility to the humblest mechanic." A generation later that stout John Bull,

William Cobbett, whose pen-name of "Porcupine" was well chosen, found the French people "civil, pious and amiable even to excess."

The territory of the French Republic, roughly speaking, is not far from square. The longest straight line that could be drawn in it from north to south is six hundred miles and its greatest breadth from east to west, running out to the extremity of the promontory of Brittany, is five hundred and twenty-eight miles. Half of its boundaries are formed by two thousand miles of salt water, and the remainder of the border line is marked, on the south, by the great barrier of the Pyrenees and, on the east, by the snows and glaciers of the Alps, sloping down into the hills of the Jura. Where its territory extends northward past the base of these hills the limit is marked by the broad current of the Rhine.

No part of this boundary is a mathematical line like that which separates the United States from western Canada. It follows the sinuosities of natural obstacles. Even in that portion between the Rhine and the North Sea which runs through flat alluvial plains, crossing rivers but not following their banks, it is full of bends and turns, clearly emphasizing the fact that it has been established as a consequence of intricate political conditions. France is about the size of New England and the Middle States plus West Virginia and Maryland, and her territory contains a population equal to about a third of our total population.

The soil of France is on the whole extremely fertile and she overlaps the invisible boundaries which separate the beauties and gifts of the north from the delights and charms of the south. Before the war it was the only country of western Europe which could raise enough wheat for its own use. The misty salt meadows and cool mountain pastures fatten millions of sheep and the upland plains of Aubrac, where, at evening, the lonely herdsman

chants his wild music to the grazing herd, is only one of the centres for the cattle that range a thousand hills. From the apple trees of Normandy, over whose rank tops the hand of spring throws a veil of beauty, to the Provençal slopes, where, amid the olives, daffodils and roses bloom in millions for the peddlers' carts of the chilly streets of winter Paris, the friendly soil, used for more than a century to the touch of millions of peasant cultivators who love the little farm that has fed their forebears, brings forth in abundance the things that make life pleasant. France, like the lands of the North and Baltic Seas, raises flax to furnish the napery for the feasts of simple homes and she rivals Italy as a feeding-ground of the ugly worms which furnish the raw material for the beauty of delicate fabrics to adorn her daughters in their festive moods; while in six great centres of viticulture as far apart as Champagne and the Médoc, her riverbanks and sunny hillsides render to patient labour the largest, the most varied, and the best crop in the world of wine which "maketh glad the heart of man."

The causes of this fertility are the continuous, patient labour of generations, the nature of the different soils of France, her climate, and finally the network of rivers by which she is covered. It is estimated that counting affluents, France is watered by over six thousand streams, large and small, and these furnish her soil a very complete natural irrigation.

All four of the greater rivers have their source in the mountains or high plains. For more than a quarter of the surface of France is in mountain lands. Part of these lie on the western slopes of the Alps—part lie on the northern slopes of the Pyrenees, but the greatest part of them (about one-sixth of the total surface of France) are in what is called by geographers the "Massif Central"; a group of mountains lying in the angle of the line of the Alps and the Pyrenees. From these mountain lands and

high plains come three of the chief river systems of France, flowing by similar courses and at about equal distances from each other, westerly to the Atlantic: in the south the tributaries of the Gironde, in the north the Seine, in the middle the Loire. The fourth great river of France is the Rhone, which rises in Switzerland and makes its way westward through the French Alps until it strikes the *Massif Central* at the city of Lyons and turning at right angles flows due south to the Mediterranean.

PERIOD 1

THE CIVILIZATION OF THE MEDITERRANEAN SPREADS OVER FRANCE

From Cæsar's Conquest to the Great Barbarian Invasions: 60 B. C. to 400 A. D.

A. Preroman France.
B. The Roman Conquest.
C. Gallo-Roman Civilization. The Anarchy, the Restoration and the Decadence.
D. What Rome Did for Gaul.
Chapters II, III, IV.

CHAPTER II

PREROMAN GAUL. THE ROMAN CONQUEST

It has taken many centuries for the French people to tame their beautiful, fertile land and to extend their law and their civilization, their art, their literature, their language, or the common love of a common country to the full natural limits of the compact block of territory between the Alps, the Pyrenees, the Mediterranean, the North Sea and the Atlantic Ocean, which is the physical form of the spiritual entity, France. The perfect unity of France, made so evident in the World War, is not a dead level of uniformity. It is a unity wrought out of great variety by an age long process, continuing through different epochs of social and political organization, through contrasting methods of self expression in art and literature. This long process of union and absorption, carried on by seventy generations of men, has left its traces in such visible things as the distinction in physical type between the dwellers in Lorraine and the people of Languedoc, the contrast between the aqueduct at Nismes and the cathedral at Chartres, the difference between Provençal poetry and the Institutes of Calvin, the variety of dialects spoken by peasants of different sections, and even the survival of languages as different from French as the Alsatian German. Premier Poincaré said recently at Strassburg: "Alsace is not the only place in France where two languages exist side by side. The Bretons, Flamands, Basques, Provençals and Corsicans still keep their own tongues but are none the worse Frenchmen for that." This absorption and extension was completed only after the middle of the last century. The very name France is,

compared with the two thousand years of her history, modern.

Cæsar called the ancestors of the French, Gauls, a word which had been long used by the Romans. In his account of Gaul and how he conquered it may be found a convenient starting point for that long story of amalgamation and development by which the French nation has been formed out of elements more varied than those which in a much shorter period of time have been combined in the people of the United States.

But there is a prelude to the story of the Roman conquest.

The establishment of the Roman Empire between the desert of Sahara, the Rhine, the Danube, the Caucasus and the Atlantic was all but accomplished by the beginning of our era. It halted, or at least diminished during four hundred years, the previously dominant feature of the history of mankind in Europe and Western Asia: an all but universal restlessness compelling masses of people to move like swarms of bees. In these great migrations to new lands the moving tribes killed, expelled, enslaved or amalgamated the previous inhabitants. There are traces in unwritten history of this process of violent mass migrations in Gaul extending back for more than a thousand years before the Roman conquest, but our first definite knowledge of what was going on begins when Greeks from Asia Minor, about six hundred years before Christ, established the city of Marseilles near the mouth of the Rhone.

They found there inhabitants called Iberians closely related to people scattered over the whole south of France. Upon these Iberians there had descended from the North Sea, probably centuries before, people known as Ligurians. Both these peoples have left in names of places, fragments of their unknown languages; which philologists assume to recognize; apparently on the rather

simple principle that any word which cannot be demonstrated to be something else, must be Iberian or Ligurian. If they furnish to the history of France little that is clearly traceable, they give us at least these names to stimulate the imagination to the conception of a great antiquity from which that history emerges.

Upon the two more ancient human strata of Iberians and Ligurians there descended out of the centre of Europe, then all but unknown to the Mediterranean peoples, a new flood of migrant fighting tribes who called themselves Celts. During the fourth century before Christ, they established their control over Great Britain, France, except the watershed of the Rhone, half of Spain, South Germany, North Italy, and a large part of the valley of the Danube. This huge territory did not contain anything like an organized state. It was merely the seat of more or less restless tribes of the same stock, who loved war and were quite ready to combine for a raid upon more civilized people in search of fighting and plunder.

Their kinsmen, who had settled in northern Italy long before, had been conquered by the Romans, organized into a province, colonized, latinized, and finally absorbed into the mass of Roman citizens. But the Romans did not stop with that. Calls to defend their ally, Marseilles, the need of an outlet for colonization to relieve poverty at Rome, wars with the tribes across the Alps, the desire to command trade with Gaul and to protect the roads into Spain, brought about the establishment of the Roman Province of Transalpine Gaul (about 120 B. C.), which extended from Toulouse on the west to Vienne and the Lake of Geneva.

The inhabitants of this province of Transalpine Gaul suffered the misgovernment so common in the first century before Christ, among the provinces of the Roman Republic which was trying vainly to rule a huge conquered empire under republican forms. The corruption

and oppression of provincial government is suggested by the remark attributed to an ex-governor indicted for corruption that every governor during his term had to make three fortunes: one to pay the debts he owed when he left Rome, one to bribe the jury in Rome when he was put on trial for extortion, and the last for himself.

Julius Cæsar, the man who began to change one of the most hate-inspiring governments the world has known into what became, for a time, the most efficient and conciliating administration of conquered provinces in history, was born in 102 B. C. of patrician parents. After a rapid political career at Rome, he got himself appointed by the Senate, Proconsul of Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul, and in eight years he conquered all the rest of Gaul.

He was an incarnation of the spirit of his people. His intense patriotism was broad, and behind Rome he saw the world she was to rule and defend. His pride was the source of exhaustless energy and self confidence. It also nourished in him ruthless cruelty to barbarians. The race inheritance of courage, discipline and skill guided by the experience of centuries of successful war, he handled with the certainty of a genius in the art of mass killing. He saw ultimately in the reign of justice the foundation of peace.

He begins his account of his campaigns by the statement, "Gaul is a whole divided into three parts"; the Aquitanians in the south between the Garonne and the Pyrenees, the Belgæ to the north of the river Seine, and, in the middle, between the Garonne and the Seine, "a people called in their own tongue Celtæ, in the Latin, Galli." This is the clever simplification of a very complicated situation by a master of style. These three divisions were not geographically bounded with exactitude according to his formula. Nor do they represent definite political units. We know the names of seventy-two of the more important tribes: twelve among the Aquitanians, forty-

three among the Galli, and seventeen among the Belgæ. These tribes spoke different dialects; they were jealous of each other, and frequently at war among themselves. They were called by a common name, but they could form and act on a common purpose in war only and even then, unity was partial and unstable. If all the Celts could have acted persistently together Cæsar would not have conquered Gaul.

It has been estimated that, at the time of the Roman conquest, there were about five million people in Gaul; which means that great stretches of land were uncultivated and covered with dense forests. The Gauls were country dwellers but they had cities which were often located in swamps or on the tops of hills, so as to be easier to defend. Very rough walls of rubble without cement surrounded them. Many of these fortresses were scattered over the country as places of refuge for the country people, and probably most of the craftsmen lived in them permanently.

The artistic capacity of the Celts seems to have been limited to a certain ability to work and ornament metals. Among a warlike people this naturally showed itself in the decoration of arms. The great shield of wood had plates of wrought iron in the centre and its bright colours were heightened with chasings in bronze, silver or gold. The swords were ornamented with drops of coral, with enamels, with fancy scabbards and hilts. In days of peace the nobles wore gay coloured trousers, cloak and blouse striped or checked, and often embroidered in gold. To this they added jewelry: bracelets, necklaces, rings. They had coins, of silver in the south, of gold in the north, and of bronze everywhere. These were rather bad imitations, first of Greek and then of Roman, coins, with their inscriptions in Greek or Latin, sometimes in both. Very rough narrow roads with wooden bridges over some of the rivers connected the different sections of the country.

The religion of the Gauls played an important part in their life. They worshipped many gods, and Cæsar identified some of these with the Roman gods; but probably the wish was father to the thought of one who was trying to reduce Gaul to subjection and make it a bulwark rather than a danger to Rome. They had a regular priesthood, set apart from all other men, excused from taxes and exempt from service in war. These priests, called Druids, acted as judges for important disputes or crimes and tried, often unsuccessfully, to act as peacemakers among the tribes. Their heaviest penalty was to condemn the accused to play the part in sacrifice of a victim to the Gods. For these sacrifices they constructed huge figures of osiers whose limbs were filled with living men mingled with kindling. "These are set on fire and the men perish in flame. They think that these executions are more grateful to the immortal Gods when those taken in theft or other crime fill the figure, but, when there are not enough of these, they resort to the execution of people free from any charge of wrong-doing." (Cæsar.)

A Gallic tribe was organized on an aristocratic basis. The nobles were distinguished by birth, by wealth, and by the fact that they fought on horseback. Most of a nobleman's close neighbours were what the Romans called his clients. Cæsar mentions three grades of these. The highest were the *soldurii* or battle comrades of a chief. He shared his plenty with them in peace: they were sworn to share danger and death with him. None of them could honourably survive the death of their comrade. The Gallic noble lived in his strong manor house on the borders of a river or the edge of the woods, where he hunted the stag, the bear and the aurochs. From time to time he invited his friends with their retainers to a great feast. At these a huge profusion of food was, at the lower tables, roughly served. At the upper tables, the nobles ate from copper or silver plates, while the great tankard, filled with

mead, or perhaps with wine from the south, went from hand to hand. When the victor came back from battle, he carried the heads of his fallen enemies at his saddle-bow to hang them afterwards above his gate.

Each tribe was governed by magistrates elected by a tribal senate which decided all important affairs. For the aristocracy had not long before destroyed the ancient office of king in almost all the tribes. But there were uncrowned kings in plenty. A great noble with his train of clients might set at naught the will of the senate. Two great nobles might split a city or a score of villages into hostile factions. To repress such ambition or disorder there was no appeal to the people; for the people had nothing to do with affairs of state, and there was no popular assembly which exercised efficient control over government.

Upon this troubled condition of Gaul there threatened to descend two great dangers from without which made the Gauls feel that Cæsar arrived in the nick of time to help them. Their Celtic kinsmen, the Helvetii, who inhabited western Switzerland, set fire to their own villages, and with cattle, carts, women and children started to march westward through the Roman province to conquer Gaul. Cæsar barred their path, slaughtered two-thirds of them, and drove the remnant back to their ruined homes. Scarcely was this invasion repulsed when several Gallic tribes begged Cæsar for help against the Germans, who were moving again out of the northern forests. It was less than fifty years since a great horde of Germans had swept down through Gaul and annihilated three Roman armies before they had been exterminated by Marius, the uncle of Cæsar. Cæsar cut this new German army to pieces and its leader barely escaped across the Rhine.

So far Cæsar had acted as a friend and protector of the Gauls, but the Roman army never withdrew again within

the bounds of the Roman Province. Suspicious of Cæsar's intentions, local confederacies of tribes successively attacked the Romans. The Belgæ raised a huge army but Cæsar by habile tactics beat it in detail with the help and guidance of neighbouring tribes, enemies of the Belgæ. The next year a maritime tribe called the Veneti seized two legates sent to buy grain. Cæsar, with the help of other maritime Gallic tribes, built a fleet of galleys which annihilated the sailing ships of the Veneti. Desiring an excuse for cruelty he judged useful, he told the conquered people "they had cast into prison legates—a title always sacred among all nations. He therefore put all their senators to the sword and sold the rest of them as slaves."

So far he had beaten Gauls with the help of Gauls, but his conquering attitude finally provoked something as much like a general uprising as could be achieved by such a mass of jealous tribes united only by a common hatred. Most of the tribes of central Gaul joined the movement, which found a leader in Vercingetorix, "a youth whose father had held the chieftainship of all Gaul and, because he aimed at the kingship, had been put to death by his own tribe."

After some skilful campaigning which put Cæsar in danger, Vercingetorix allowed himself to be brought to bay in the apparently impregnable fortress of Alesia. Cæsar shut him in by a wall eleven miles long and waited for hunger to do its work. Before the strangling circle was complete, Vercingetorix sent out messengers to raise Gaul for his relief. Cæsar constructed most elaborate entrenchments with three ditches, one twenty, two fifteen, feet broad and deep to provide against the surprise of his palisade twelve feet high. Eight rows of three-foot pits concealing stakes sharpened and hardened in the fire were added. This was duplicated in a larger circle turned outward. He tells us that forty-five tribes sent contingents to the army of relief amounting to 8,000 horse and about

250,000 foot. They made three desperate assaults on the Roman lines, while at the same time the inner barrier was attacked from the fortress. The third push of the Gauls almost went through. One by one, Cæsar sent into the fight small bodies of his dwindling reserves. With the last he marched to the most dangerous point; gleaming at the head of his men in the scarlet cloak of a commander-in-chief. At the sight the hard pressed Romans, whose confidence in Cæsar was unlimited, dropped their pikes and with a mighty shout fell upon the enemy with their short heavy swords. The Gauls broke and fled but were cut off by the Roman cavalry; so that, "of that huge host few escaped to their camp." Seventy-four Gallic battle standards were brought to Cæsar and the relieving force fled in panic.

The next morning Vercingetorix called a council of his chiefs, said he had begun this war not on his own account but to defend the common liberty, and bade them make the best terms they could with Cæsar by delivering him up either dead or alive. The Roman preferred him alive, kept him six years in prison at Rome, paraded him up to the Capitoline hill in triumphal procession and then beheaded him. The army of Vercingetorix was distributed as slaves among Cæsar's men, and every soldier had at least one to sell to the slave dealers who followed the Roman armies.

Thus ended the skilful and pitiless Roman conquest of Gaul. It had been an unequal struggle; even if we accept literally Cæsar's suspiciously large estimates of the number of his foes. Unorganized Celtic courage was no match for Roman discipline, nor could crafty barbarian chiefs face one of the world's great masters of the art of war. Besides he shrewdly noted a defect even in the Gallic courage; a defect urged against their descendants by friend and foe for centuries afterward. "While the temperament of the Gauls," wrote Cæsar, "shows eagerness

to undertake a campaign . . . they are not at all steadfast in enduring disaster." Seventeen hundred years later Richelieu made the same remark about the soldiers of his armies—a remark rendered forever inapplicable by the Marne and Verdun.

CHAPTER III

THE EMPIRE SLOWLY ABSORBS GAUL. THE ANARCHY AND DECADENCE OF THE EMPIRE

It is no impeachment of the courage of the Gauls that the sons of those who had fought Cæsar accepted rather willingly the Roman domination, and were wise enough to let themselves be Romanized in a comparatively short space of time.

Rome interfered as little as possible at first with Gallic tastes and habits. Neither the language, nor the religion, nor the local government of the tribes was restricted. The oppressive power of the nobles was limited by laws, but military force was not unnecessarily paraded before the conquered. Rome indeed imposed tribute and recruiting for her armies, but there were plenty of Gauls not averse to fighting in an ever victorious army, and the prosperity of the people was probably less interfered with by Roman taxes than by the old exactions of their own nobles. The conquerors moved very slowly and waited for the help of time in all changes which implied the risk of arousing dislike for the strange and unknown. Above all, they brought to Gaul the *pax romana;* an end of the ceaseless internecine war between tribe and tribe, between faction and faction, between noble and noble. Under Roman dominion the Roman peace spread like oil upon stormy waters, while along the fortified border which stretched from the lower Rhine to the mouth of the Danube, the Roman legions stood on guard against the great mass of Germanic barbarism ever threatening to pour out from the dark, fear-inspiring forests of the north.

There were some local insurrections, but these were

ended twenty years after Cæsar's conquest, and Gaul was tranquil under Roman rule for a hundred years. The spectacle of the grotesque tyranny of Nero (54–68) was answered by revolt in Gaul as in other provinces. But it was a revolt against the Emperor. The Gauls were faithful to the Empire. A legate of Lower Germany gave the reasons for this attitude:

"We Romans came into your country at the request of your ancestors who were tired of their own internecine strife which made them the prey of the Germans. Since that time we have held the watch on the Rhine—not to protect Italy, but to prevent some new German invader from crossing to reign over you. The danger is not past. The Germans are poor and you are rich. If we demand military service and tribute from you, it is in order to keep you in peace. . . . Our city is no jealous and niggardly city. We share the goods she gives us. How many times have you Gauls been seen commanding our legions or governing our provinces? Love then that city which gives herself equally to victors and vanquished. What would happen, oh ye immortal gods, if she should fall? Immediately war would be unchained among the nations. It has taken eight hundred years to erect this edifice. He who should shake its foundations would be crushed in its fall."

This peaceable conquest of Gaul was launched by the nephew of Julius Cæsar, Augustus, who in 29 B. C. became, to use his own phrase, "master of all things." He began to establish upon the ruins of the aristocratic republic, an empire which enforced peace within definite boundaries by resistless military power and developed a system of universal law.

The idea has been emphasized during the past two generations, notably by great German scholars, that this centralizing work of Imperial Rome, conquering all the Mediterranean nations, was so indispensable to the develop-

ment of European civilization that, without it, Western Europe would have remained what Africa was in the last century. This assumption has been questioned, notably by French scholars who hoped that in the permanent organization of modern Europe, nationalistic ideas would prevail over imperial ideas. For example, one of the leading French historians of this generation wrote: "It is not certain that Cæsar's conquest of Vercingetorix was a blessing to the world."

Certainly it does not seem wise to assume too dogmatically that what did happen was always the best thing that could have happened. The question whether the only possible path toward European civilization led through a dead level of uniformity under Roman dominance, is one that can be more easily discussed than decided. But the following statement in the same realm of hypothetical history, would probably be approved by all modern historians: that *if* Rome was to standardize the civilization of the Mediterranean to a single type, she had to change the aristocratic Republic into an Empire more or less absolute.

Augustus and the ablest of his successors changed Gaul from a menace to a bulwark of the Empire because they were conscious of Rome's task as Virgil defined it:

"I believe, indeed,
Others will mould more delicately breathing images in bronze
And evoke living faces from marble:
Others will plead causes better before judges,
Map out the paths of the heavens and announce the rising stars.
But thou, Oh! Roman, remember to rule the peoples by thy Empire:
These will be thy arts, to impose the custom of peace,
To spare the vanquished and to beat down the haughty."

Augustus organized Gaul into four provinces which extended from the city of Lyons like the sticks of a fan. The chief ruler of a province was a governor. In prov-

inces where tranquillity was not immediately threatened, the chief function of a governor was the administration of justice as president of the tribunal where he administered the Roman law. This existed for a time side by side with the Celtic law; but individuals and cities progressively renounced their own law in favour of the Roman law. For, although the penalties of the Roman law were very severe, and it acknowledged privileged classes, it was written and not oral, and administered by professional judges: not, like the Celtic law by priests or nobles. In addition, it granted some independence to woman, established equality of inheritance, suppressed enslavement for debt, and gave some protection even to the slave.

The inhabitants of the Gallic provinces had to pay to Rome tribute. The Roman theory of tribute was based on the idea that the soil of the conquered became the property of the conqueror, although it was generally allowed to remain in the hands of the proprietors. There were also taxes called indirect, an inheritance tax, a tax on sales, etc. The Empire was divided into nine circumscriptions for customs taxes, but it was a tariff for revenue only. Not that the Romans were averse to the idea of helping Italians against provincials. The Emperor Domitian ordered that at least half the vines in all the provinces should be destroyed. This was intended to aid Italians in the sale of wine and the purchase of wheat, by making wine scarce and wheat plentiful. But it was never strictly enforced.

In spite of all the protests against it, the Roman system of taxation could not have been too bad: otherwise Gaul would not have left traces of a great growth in wealth and a spreading material prosperity during two hundred and fifty years.

So far as local government was concerned the Empire created a strong unifying influence in the new worship of Rome; a force which seemed as beneficent as Apollo the

God of the Sun, or Ceres the Goddess of Harvests. This new divinity became for them personified in the Emperor as the Genius of the Empire. To the man of ancient times worship and politics were inseparable, and it was as inconceivable to separate a tribe or a state from its religion as to make a coin with only one side. In addition, both the Celts and the Romans were polytheists, and to place a new god in the Pantheon was in no sense shocking to them. The willingness to offer divine honours to a man while he was living and to enroll him definitely among the immortal gods when he died, had its roots in mythological conceptions of the existence of demi-gods. Skeptical wits of a satirical temper might privately joke about making gods out of emperors, many of whom their palace intimates knew had more than a due measure of human frailty, but critical intellects who did not take apotheosis literally, saw no harm in accepting what was so useful to the state. To the average citizen it seemed so natural that, when the Jew or the Christian could find no place for it in his theory of the universe, his attitude could only be explained as the expression of a malign enmity to the human race.

This unifying idea of a new worship common to all the subjects of the beneficent Empire which was the only defence of civilization against surrounding barbarism, was applied to Gaul by the erection of altars to Rome. The greatest of these state altars was built just outside the city of Lyons on territory common to The Three Gauls. This symbol of unity under a dominion which meant the death of local enmity and the reign of peace, was voted by an assembly of the representatives of the sixty-four tribes of The Three Gauls about forty years after the end of Cæsar's conquest. They erected a colossal altar consecrated to the Goddess Roma and the Genius of the Emperor. It stood on a great stone terrace surmounted by tripods decorated with shields, with carvings

of laurel and oak leaves, and an inscription in large letters of gold to Rome and Augustus. On either side were two huge columns of Egyptian granite, surmounted by winged victories offering a crown and holding a palm in the other hand. In the centre was the altar, in front of the temple dedicated to all the emperors who had received apotheosis. This great construction was surrounded by a park with gardens and artificial lakes. At this altar, on the first of August each year, the representatives of the tribes assembled to worship Rome and the Emperor.

With the form of local government in Gaul, the Romans interfered as little as possible. The tribes at the time of the conquest remained the units of local government. These tribes were not centred in a city, like the states of Italy and Greece. In Gaul there were great numbers of scattered houses and the men of rank and wealth lived in the country. The capital did not make the state—the state made the capital. Gaul became finally a country of cities, but the Romans took no abrupt steps, and the transformation seemed to come about like some change wrought slowly by the forces of nature.

As cities were planted or grew in importance under the fostering care of governors, their government was put in the hands of a senate which rested on the local aristocracy. There was no popular assembly and the senate elected the chief magistrates. In addition, the senates elected for life priests, who came to be mostly concerned with the Imperial cult. From the beginning, Roman citizens were forbidden to be present at human sacrifices, and seventy-five years after the conquest these were suppressed. Just why the Romans objected so strongly to human sacrifice when it was their custom to butcher their captives in the amphitheatre to make a holiday show for gaping thousands, is hard to see. The only explanation ready at hand is that they were more willing to have their citizens inhumane than their gods. The Druids lost in-

fluence and disappeared from history, while their ancient gods, partly by the work of Roman artists making statues of them, became more and more assimilated to the gods of Rome.

It was during the second hundred years after the conquest of Gaul that this process of romanization wrought its most complete results, and from the year 70 to the year 235 A. D., when the Emperor Alexander Severus was murdered by a barbarian officer of his army, Gaul was one of those countries the depth of whose happiness is suggested by the brevity of their history. At this time the great majority of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire evidently regarded it as highly beneficent, and some of the ablest of modern historians endorse their opinion. Gibbon wrote in 1776 of the general happiness of the Roman world under Alexander Severus, and Mommsen wrote a century later: "There are various regions of the East as of the West for which the Imperial government marks a climax of good government, very modest in itself, but never attained before or since; and if an angel of the Lord were to strike the balance whether the domain ruled by Alexander Severus was governed with the greater intelligence and the greater humanity at that time or at the present day, whether civilization and national prosperity generally have since that time advanced or retrograded, it is very doubtful whether the decision would be in favour of the present."

With the murder of the Emperor Alexander Severus began a series of disasters to the government of the civilized world which threatened its total destruction by the barbarians. In forty-nine years twenty-two emperors took the purple, not to mention the local tyrants who rose to even more fleeting power. During the eight years' reign of Gallienus there were nineteen of these, all of whom died a violent death. During this period of military anarchy, the Empire was not only unable to main-

tain order within its boundaries, it failed also in its task of keeping the barbarians out of the oasis of civilization. The Franks and Burgundians broke into Gaul and plundered to the Straits of Gibraltar, the Goths crossed the Danube and sacked the chief cities of Greece, and the Alemanni penetrated into Italy.

But this piqued the professional pride of the army and five skilful generals were allowed to rule long enough to drive back the barbarians toward the north and east and extend the Empire again to the ancient lines of defence. Its recovery and survival for a century and a quarter in a semblance of its former power is one of the most surprising victories of tenacity and skill recorded in history.

The restorer of the Empire in a form adapted to the conditions of the times, was Diocletian, one of the most capable men who have ever managed large and complicated affairs. His parents had been slaves in the household of a Roman senator. Obtaining his freedom, he became governor of a province, consul and finally commander of the Emperor's body guard. Proclaimed Emperor by the legions returning victorious from the Persian war, he reorganized the Empire and made every effort to repair the ravages of the past and to prevent their repetition.

Seventy cities of Gaul had, during the anarchy, been captured and plundered by the barbarians. He helped to restore them and assigned barbarian captives from his triumphant wars to the neighbourhood of the ancient cities now called Amiens, Beauvais, Cambrai, Langres and Troyes. The rebuilt Gallic cities of the fourth century had narrow, dark, winding streets, tightly compressed within the shortest possible circuit of a wall which left spacious public squares, amphitheatres, temples and suburban villas outside. The contrast between them and the stately cities of the best Gallo-Roman days, like Nismes or Arles, is a fair measure of the difference between

the Empire for the first two hundred and fifty years of its existence and the Empire, which, after the anarchy of the third century, Diocletian and his successors restored and maintained as best they could for another century and a quarter. To them the question was no longer: How shall the Empire best maintain peace and justice? but: Can the Empire defend civilization against barbarism at all?

No part of the Empire did more to answer this question in the affirmative than Gaul; for that province became the bulwark of the falling state. The army rolls are imperfect, but they show how large a proportion of soldiers came from Gaul, and the remains of dwindling Gallic prosperity were the chief hope of treasury officials struggling desperately to get the money to maintain, otherwise than on paper, the legions needed to hold the frontiers.

As Gaul became for over a century the chief bulwark of the decadent Empire, so also it became the heaviest sufferer from the wrong fiscal principles of its laws and the growing severity of its bureaucracy.

The tribute was not increased but it seemed heavier to less prosperous people. The tax collectors were merciless and the laws armed them with power to torture slaves to get evidence about concealment of values. The tendency was to roll the burden from the shoulders of the rich onto the shoulders of the poor; or at least of the middle class. The *curiales* were made responsible for the taxes assessed in a lump sum against their community. This sum they had to allocate and collect. Necessity made them pitiless against recalcitrant taxpayers, and when their stern régime had reduced to indigence the poorer classes, their own fortunes were ruined to make up the resultant deficit in the tax.

These vicious principles and results of taxation, perhaps impossible to avoid, stifled the energies of Gaul and

prevented the rebuilding of the prosperity which had been checked by the ravages of the barbarians before they were driven back again beyond the boundaries. These misfortunes had been followed in many parts by famine, and not far behind famine stalked her younger sister, pestilence. An infection whose source is unknown, spread among the weakened population of the Empire and lasted for fifteen years, during which it acquired a terrible virulence. For instance, statistical evidence has survived to show that in one large city half the inhabitants perished. The depopulation of this plague was, for the Empire and for Gaul, now its leading province, a beginning of evils which brought growing weakness. The greatest Emperors like able physicians in the presence of a mortal malady, could do no more than prolong the life of the state.

CHAPTER IV

WHAT ROME DID FOR GAUL

With the beginning of the fifth century the fortified northern and eastern boundaries of the Empire were broken all but simultaneously in several places, and the barbarism of the north began to spread over Gaul. At this point therefore (400 A. D.) it may be well to summarize briefly what Mediterranean civilization had done for Gaul.

It is fair to assume that the Gallo-Roman period of four hundred and fifty years which spread the civilization of the Mediterranean over Gaul, left a permanent impress on French history. True, the political, commercial, linguistic and artistic unity of Roman Gaul perished in later centuries, and tracing invisible elements across the lapse of years often leads to delusion. But it is hard to abandon at the call for direct proof, the feeling, the fancy if you will, that certain artistic and intellectual traits of the French people are related to the willingness of their ancestors of long ago to accept the civilization of the Mediterranean from the hands of Rome.

One material result of the Gallo-Roman period certainly has survived through all the centuries. Of the twelve largest cities of modern France eight are on the sites of Roman towns, and of the eighteen next largest, thirteen are on Roman foundations; together with more than thirty of lesser rank. Some of these were new cities and some small Gallic towns were developed into great trading depots by the Gallo-Romans. Lyons was a Roman creation and for two hundred years the chief government centre and the commercial metropolis of Gaul. Its rapid rise in wealth was chiefly due to the fact that it

became the chief centre of travel and transportation. The avenues of traffic for first and second century Gaul centred at Lyons, very much as the canals and railroads of modern France centre at Paris.

Paris waited long before she became the leading, or even a leading, city. For centuries she was surpassed in wealth or influence by cities now visited only by the professional archeologist. The little city was the capital of an unimportant tribe of the lower Seine, the Parisii, and it was called Lutetia. Under the Roman peace it spread from its defensible site on an island in the river to the left bank, but it never became an important governmental, military or commercial centre of Roman Gaul. Even at that time, however, Paris seems to have had some of the seductive charm which, far more than her splendour, now wins the hearts of those who know and truly love her. The Emperor Julian looked back from the luxurious and vicious atmosphere of Antioch to the halcyon days when, as Cæsar of the West, charged with the defense of the Rhine boundary, he was in winter quarters "in my dear Lutetia, for so the Celts call the little city of the Parisii. The river surrounds it on all sides and a wooden bridge connects it with each bank. The height of the river varies little with the seasons and the water is pleasant to the eye and very good to drink. Because of the nearness of the ocean and the rather warm fogs, the winter is mild. Good vines grow there and even fig trees, if they are muffled from the cold with straw." It was more than a thousand years after Cæsar's conquest before Julian's "dear little Lutetia" became definitely the capital of forming France and began her career of influence and of splendour.

It is interesting to note the comment made by Gibbon in 1776 on this passage written in 362: "If Julian could now visit the capital of France, he might converse with men of science and genius capable of understanding and

of instructing a disciple of the Greeks; he might excuse the light and graceful follies of a nation whose martial spirit has never been enervated by the indulgence of luxury; and he must applaud the perfection of that inestimable art which softens and refines and embellishes the intercourse of social life."

Celtic architecture was not advanced enough to use cut stone and when the Gaul became a city dweller, he enlarged or built his cities in the Roman style. The villas of wealthy Gauls came to be like Roman villas in form, in frescoes, in mosaic pavements, in statues and ornamentation. The only originality was suggested by the climate: pipes for hot water and panes in the window sashes. His statues the rich Gaul imported from Greece or Rome; or else he had copies made by more or less skilful artists. Signed mosaics and pottery from Greek artists have also been found, and rude imitations of Greek table pottery and of figurines in terra-cotta were sold in vast numbers.

One proof of the thorough romanizing of Gaul is the complete disappearance of the Celtic language and its replacement by spoken Latin. In modern French there are only twenty-six words which are plainly of Celtic origin. This exchange of Celtic for Latin was voluntary. The Romans were far too clever rulers to employ the useless tyranny of prohibiting the mother tongue of millions of their new subjects. They were content to await the work of time. Probably for generations in many parts of Gaul educated people were bilingual; as in modern Finland or Belgium. The Celtic was never much written, and for inscriptions Latin seems to have been used from the start: out of more than ten thousand found in Gaul only about a score are in Celtic. Government transactions also were carried on in Latin. The nobles, therefore, who hoped to obtain government functions—and the Romans gave them every chance of doing so—had to learn Latin. So

the young Gallic nobles flocked to the schools established by the government, where they might get the keys not only to political power and influence but to the great treasure house of Latin and Greek literature.

About the primary schools of the Roman epoch we know little except that they evidently existed, in the shape of widely diffused private institutions. But almost immediately after the formation of the Empire, institutions of higher learning were established in Gaul. From the first century on, there were flourishing schools at Autun, Lyons, Toulouse, Nismes, Vienne, Narbonne and Marseilles, to which were added later institutions at Trier, Poitiers, Besançon, and Bordeaux. The professors were natives of Gaul with the exception of a few Greeks.

The Latin literature produced in Gaul is lacking in names comparable to those to be found in the list of writers born in the provinces of Africa or Spain. In only one art—eloquence—was Gaul distinguished. Many Gallic advocates were, in different generations, counted among the leaders of the Roman bar. In the art of poetry the most important Gaul during four hundred years was Ausonius, whose life nearly covered the fourth century. At the age of twenty-four he was appointed professor, first of grammar and then of rhetoric, at Bordeaux. Thirty years later he was called to be tutor to the son of the Emperor. When the pupil became Emperor, he advanced his tutor to the very highest political distinction. After his patron had been murdered, Ausonius retired to spend many tranquil years on his estates near Bordeaux. Out of this leisure came the most interesting part of his poetry. His friends, who were the chief literary critics of his day, formed a sort of unorganized mutual admiration society and the leaders of the chorus of praise ranked Ausonius as equal or even superior to Virgil; which causes Gibbon to remark dryly: "The poetical fame of Ausonius condemns the taste of his age."

Indiscriminate praise is frequently the herald of undeserved oblivion. The pegasus of Ausonius lacks wings and trots along on all fours; the human sympathy of his verse is narrow, it displays a minimum of imagination and no poetic passion. Nevertheless some of his poetry has an agreeable flavour like the home cooking (*cuisine bourgeoise*) so often promised on the placards of the small inns of modern France. His thumbnail sketches of his relations, like a collection of family snapshots, sometimes grow tiresome, but once in a while startle us with a trait of lifelikeness. His love of nature seems at times more simple and direct than the somewhat conventionalized descriptions of later classic eclogues.

The best of his poems is on the Moselle. He describes in verse that flows like the gently murmuring river, the limpid waters "naught concealing, clear as air when winds are still," showing far below how "the furrowed sand is rippled by the light current, and the bowed water grasses quiver in their green bed now displaying, now hiding, the gleaming pebbles, the gravel or the green moss of the bottom." After the water he summons "to lead on another pageant, the vines thickly planted from the lofty ridges to the foot of the slopes." A little touch of stock mythology follows, as he imagines "the wanton frolicking nymphs ducking those clumsy swimmers, the satyrs, and then slipping from arms that clasp only yielding waves." Then he comes back to things he has seen.

"What a glow was on the shallows when the shades of evening fell
And the verdure of the mountains bathed the breast of fair Moselle!
In the grassy stream reflected, float the hills in wavy line,
Swells the vintage, sways the trembling tendril of the absent vine."

After a description of the streams that flow into the Moselle and compliments to some of the great men serving letters or the state at the capital, Treves, the poet launches

with gusto into a description of the long lines of splendid villas which crown the river banks. Then with apologies to the Tiber, to whom "belongs this higher praise that thou dost guard the seat of Empire and the homes of Rome," he is ready to call on the Rhine "to spread thine azure folds and glass green robe to give room for a brother's waters to come to swell thee." But not before he has given many lines to a careful catalogue of fifteen fish, from the salmon to the gudgeon, which the fisher, with his dripping nets or his hooks cast from the rocks, is always pursuing.

Perhaps the most notable thing about this best poem of the best poet of Romanized Gaul, is its tranquillity. Three years before it was written, a plundering horde of Germans had been surprised and slaughtered on the banks of the Moselle. Only a few miles away were the great forests threatening to disgorge new barbarians, but Ausonius does not let himself be disturbed. He sings of clear waters and vines and fish and nymphs and villas. It is perhaps not fanciful to recognize in him across the ages a true Frenchman, behind whose traditional susceptibility to sudden emotion there is a fundamental imperturbability in regard to daily habit. When the government of France in 1914 had withdrawn to Bordeaux because the German was at the gates of Paris, the fishermen still sat on the quais and watched their corks float tranquilly on the current of the Seine.

The conclusion that Gallo-Roman society gave a place for deep family affection and pleasant family life, rests on stronger evidence than isolated poems. A great number of inscriptions for the dead representing all classes of society, record, in a style whose simplicity suggests sincerity, grief for "a dear wife who during thirty-six years never caused me the least pain"; or a son "who lived eleven years beloved by everybody for his childlike grace," etc., etc. These indicate that for centuries, under

the rule of Roman peace and the protection of Roman law, many simple and prosperous families in Gaul enjoyed the heritage of pleasure in the common blessings of human life.

Gaul, like all other parts of the Roman Empire, felt the influence from the end of the first century on, of religions coming from the East like the cult of Mithras, originally a Persian god of light, whose doctrine was expressed in a very elaborate symbolism. The worship of Cybele, the Great Mother of the Gods, came from Asia Minor and, during the third century, spread over eastern and southern Gaul from Bordeaux to Lyons. Its chief ceremony was the expiatory sacrifice of a bull so arranged that the blood should flow over the worshipper placed in a ditch below. In the second century Christianity began to spread in Gaul, not by way of Rome, but chiefly from the East and, before the century was over, the howling mob of the amphitheatre of Lyons had seen the first Christian martyrs.

The early Emperors were suspicious of associations, but, after the anarchy of the third century, they changed their policy and allowed rather freely workmen's associations, and their existence helped the process, by which callings throughout the Empire became fixed and hereditary. A specimen of this result can be seen in what was done to the members of the associations formed by those in government employ in the mints, arsenals, tapestries, or mines. Even the freemen among these were, under the later Empire, branded with a hot iron so that they could not change their way of gaining a living. In their internal affairs these artisans corporations were allowed a large degree of freedom without supervision, and though very different from the guilds of the Middle Ages, and still more different from the trades unions of our day, they seem, as we look back on them, like so many features of Roman society, faint prophecies of far off things.

Under the later Empire we find also gathered around the dominant class in Gallo-Roman social organization, the agricultural aristocracy, arrangements and relationships which were the germs of some mediæval social institutions. The members of that dominant privileged class were called senators, but only a small part of the senators had ever sat in the senate at Rome. The rank of a local senator became hereditary, and, in addition, the fact that a man had filled certain functions in the provinces or had been named by the Emperor, made him a senator.

The bulk of these people of senatorial rank were great landed proprietors: thirteen hundred acres was considered in the fourth century a very small property. The rural population had become in various ways more and more dependent on these large proprietors and the small farmer had, by the end of the fourth century, become rare. The economic and social customs, whose development and spread brought this about, were chiefly four. 1. *Recommendation* was a development of the old Roman idea of patron and client. A man who had need of protection *recommended* himself to his powerful neighbour, promising obedience and support in exchange. 2. The *précaire* was often associated with recommendation. In this transaction the owner gave his land to the large proprietor, who granted the use of it and protection to the giver. The two other customs can be described together, for their outcome was the same—to create a class intermediate between slaves and free men. Slave labour is not highly productive. So the custom arose of giving to a slave a cabin and the fixed use of a piece of land to work on shares. As this arrangement was recorded in the tax list as a basis of valuation, the law came to forbid the sale of the lands without these slaves; though they could be sold off the land. A similar result was brought about by

free farmers becoming coloni. The colonus was not a slave. But, after he had gotten onto the tax list as a renter of a certain piece of land, he was fixed upon it forever—he and his children after him. The proprietor, however, could not sell him off it, nor could the buyer of the land replace him by another colonus.

The landed aristocracy, which grew wealthy partly through these conditions, came to exercise the functions of magistrates upon their estates which tended to become, as the Empire decayed, small independent semipolitical unities economically self-sufficing. In their huge villas the Gallo-Roman nobles lived a luxurious and splendid life. They visited their neighbours, they gambled and played tennis and other games, they rode and hunted both with packs of dogs and falcons. They were amateurs of literature, which most of them had studied at one of the great schools. Every gentleman was supposed to make verses and write witty or learned letters to be handed around among his friends. One of the "exercises of a gentleman" alone they despised—the use of arms.

So they and the people of Gaul, long ago disarmed by a jealous government and accustomed to leave the defense of their country to armies filled by professional soldiers from the barbarian tribes, sat by and watched the conquest of Gaul by armies of Goths and Germans and Burgundians and Franks much smaller than the hordes their ancestors had driven back across the Rhine. This was not philosophic humanitarianism, for they were not shocked by the slaughter of the contests of the arena, nor did this indifference to conquest come from disgust with the Empire and a hope to find a better master in the barbarian, for a Gallic poet thus sings the praises of Rome in the very midst of the storms of fatal barbarian invasion:

"Rome, queen superb of this world, who can live and

forget that he owes his safety to you? . . . For many nations thou hast made one country. Thou hast given to the vanquished a share in thy laws and thanks to thee the world is now become but a single nation. . . . Do not fear the mortal blow of destiny. Thou shalt live as long as the globe endures and the heaven holds the stars."

PERIOD 2

THE FLOOD OF NORTHERN BARBARISM

From the Barbarian Invasions to the Death of Charlemagne, 400 to 814

A. Clovis and the Merovingian Dynasty.
B. The Carolingians Try to Restore the Roman State, 752–814.
Chapters V and VI.

CHAPTER V

BARBARISM SPREADS. CLOVIS THE POWERFUL BARBARIAN AND HIS FAMILY

The wild tribes who, in the beginning of the fifth century, broke through the fortified boundary of the Empire were not mere raiders: they were seeking richer lands and a place in the sun. Three of these German peoples established, with the consent of feeble emperors at far off Constantinople, kingdoms in Gaul. The Visigoths by the middle of the fifth century ruled all Spain except the northwest corner together with France south of the Loire and west of the Rhone Valley. The Burgundians included in their kingdom Switzerland and most of the watershed of the Rhone. The Franks, who were the roughest and wildest of these armed immigrants, came in somewhat later and gained a foothold—at first quite small—in the north. They fought like the Scotch Highlanders with long sword and dagger, and their only defensive arms were small iron bound bucklers of wood covered with leather. Their peculiar weapon was a light battle axe or hatchet, which they could throw with the skill of a North American Indian. They were as much noted for treachery as for courage.

The first king among the Franks to display the elements of a skilful ruler of men was Clovis, who, at the age of fifteen, inherited from his father (481) the crown of a Frankish tribe. He was not content with his father's realm and the chief obstacles in the path of his ambition were his relatives, the kings of other Frankish tribes. To the son of one of them he sent a secret message, "Your father is lame and old, if he dies his king-

dom and my friendship are yours." The son killed his father sleeping in a tent on a hunting trip, and sent word to Clovis that presents were waiting for his envoys. While the new king plunged his hand into the treasure-chest of his father, one of the envoys killed him with a blow of an axe. Clovis met the assembly of the warriors of the tribe, denied all knowledge of these murders and offered his protection. They applauded his speech and acclaimed him king. Another Frankish king was taken prisoner by the adherents of Clovis and brought before him in chains. "You have dishonoured our family," said Clovis, "by allowing chains to be put upon you. It were better to have died." And with a blow of the ready war hatchet he split his prisoner's head. "And you," he added, turning to the dead king's brother, "if you had helped your brother he would not have been put in chains," and the axe fell on his head.

Clovis married a niece of the King of Burgundy, who was a Christian. One day in battle, the troops of Clovis began to give way. He cried out that his Gods had deserted him, and, raising his hands to heaven, swore, "Oh Jesus Christ, Thou who art, Clothilde declares, the Son of the living God, . . . If Thou wilt grant me to triumph over mine enemies and prove Thy power, I will be baptized in Thy name." The enemy fled and on Christmas Day, Clovis and three thousand of his warriors were baptized. This ceremony helped more towards the success of Clovis than any of his victories in war. It won for him the support of the Christian bishops against his possible rivals for the crown of all Gaul, and no class of men were more able to help his plans than the bishops.

Just how Christianity spread in Gaul during the third century is not very clear. The writer of our chief source of information lived two hundred years later and was manifestly credulous. It must have spread slowly, for when Christianity became a legal religion (313), Gaul

was still pagan and in great sections of it there were neither Christians, churches nor bishops. It was the efforts of evangelists, chiefly monks, which spread Christianity over all Gaul by a process which still took over a hundred years to complete. For it was not "till after the middle of the fifth century that the Romano-Gallic population of Gaul became substantially Christian." (Harnack.)

As the Empire declined the Church had risen. It formed a great hierarchical organization which was adopted by the Emperors of the fourth century as a part of the state machine and it was no dead part of the machine, but a living organism with a life of its own which enabled it to survive the ruin of the Empire. The chief functionary of the Church was the bishop, whose residence was always in a city; although his jurisdiction finally extended over the surrounding country (diocese). Originally the election of a bishop was by the people and clergy of his city, but, before the end of the fifth century, the neighbouring bishops of the province exercised great influence upon the choice of candidates.

The bishops met annually in a synod of the province and the canons of these meetings formed a body of Church law. Questions affecting the interests of the whole Church throughout the Empire were decided in General (Œcumenical) Councils, supposed to represent the entire body of bishops. By the middle of the fifth century four such councils had met, all of them sitting at the eastern end of the Mediterranean. Their chief business had been the decision of points of theology and the condemnation of heresy. The most important of these heresies was that of Arius, who rejected the formula to explain the doctrine of the Trinity, that the Son was of the same substance as the Father and maintained that the Son, although superior to all the rest of creation, was created. This doctrine was rejected at the first General Council

of Nicæa, and, after a long struggle, Arianism was definitely shut out from the Church.

But before this had happened, Arian missionaries had converted the Visigoths and Burgundians who, therefore, when they came into Gaul, were Christians but heretic Christians, while the Gallic clergy was extremely orthodox. Only one bishop from Gaul had, it is true, been present at the Council of Nicæa, but the leader of the anti-Arian party, Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, made, during his six years' exile in the west, many journeys through Gaul and produced a great and lasting effect upon the clergy. So that Gaul was, at the beginning of the fifth century, solidly anti-Arian and solidly anti-heretic in general.

Already the worst and most lasting of all the heresies had appeared; the doctrine that it was the duty of Christians to put to death people who held any dogma which did not agree with the theology of the Church. A Spanish priest of a noble family mixed his conception of Christianity with certain mystic eastern doctrines labeled gnostic. He made converts in Spain and southern Gaul, but a synod cut him off from the fellowship of the Church. He appealed to Cæsar and before the Imperial judgment seat at Treves he was tortured to force confession and executed with four of his disciples in 485. This action split the episcopate of Gaul and a number of bishops refused fellowship for a time with those who had urged the death of the heretics.

But although the bishops of Gaul had not yet unanimously adopted the doctrine of the duty of getting heretics killed by the state, they feared and disliked heresy intensely. So they had little sympathy with the Arian masters of Gaul who were not of the true flock. When this new royal convert, Clovis, was baptized in the name of a Holy Trinity where the relation of the Son to the Father was defined not as a "likeness," not as an "un-

likeness," not even as a "likeness of nature," but just right, under the true formula "of the substance of the Father," they felt sure that here at last was the man to whom God had given the sword of authority to protect the Church and to help them drive all the chosen sheep of God into the fold of Christ. So Gregory of Tours, who, in his history of the Franks written about a century after the conversion of Clovis, tells us most of what we know about him, sees in the Frankish conqueror what the Hebrew prophet saw in Cyrus, the Persian conqueror, "the Anointed of the Lord."

This alliance with the Church was of enormous advantage to Clovis and it was with the pride of a champion for the truth about the Trinity, that he marched against the great kingdom of the Visigoths in southern Gaul. "He said to his followers, 'I cannot bear it that these Arians occupy a part of Gaul. Let us march with the help of God, overthrow them and bring the land under our rule.'" So as the chronicler writes, "King Clovis with the help of God gained the victory." He received an imperial title and a robe of honour from the Emperor at Constantinople, and, when he died in 511, he was master of three-quarters of Gaul.

Clovis was the real founder of a dynasty, named after his grandfather, Merovech, the Merovingians, whose descendants kept the title of king for two hundred and forty years. During half this period the Merovingians were a powerful race of fighting men, avid of booty and conquest. Their semi-barbarism could not be much adorned by the remnants of Roman culture they tried to adopt, nor their underlying ferocity much softened even by the pleas for mercy of faithful bishops. The history of their rule is brutal and dull; filled with senseless fratricidal strife and horrible family crimes. These early Merovingians were, however, stout men of their hands, and the dominions of the house finally extended

over all Gaul, into Spain and into Germany. But this vast country never became united. At intervals the course of nature aided by reckless murder brought it under one scepter, but twice there were four Merovingian kings ruling at once. As a consequence there came into being four sections of the monarchy, which finally began to assert a large degree of autonomy. The last Merovingian king powerful enough to rule the united kingdom was Dagobert, who died in 639.

The vast complex of the Merovingian domain, though it never became a real state, developed a sort of political organization and social institutions which were common to a large portion of it.

The king wore the purple robe of the Roman emperors and sat upon a throne a diadem on his head. His title was hereditary and his power in many ways absolute, but, in the later times of the dynasty, there were annual assemblies of bishops and powerful laymen which limited very much the royal discretion in levying taxes or appointing great officials.

The chief officer of a unit of local government was a count appointed by the king, whose commission emphasized the count's duty to defend the widow and the orphan and to punish all evil doers that the people might dwell in peace and happiness. The tendency was to seek the counts among the great land owners. They grew therefore more and more powerful and an evil count easily degenerated into a petty tyrant against whose oppression the people were often afraid to appeal to the king. The duke was an officer higher than the count, usually appointed under some military necessity. He became a permanent officer along those boundaries of the kingdom where foes were always threatening.

There was a check upon the power of the counts in the bishops. The ancient conception of their office gave them the care of the poor and made them the natural

protectors of the weak against wrong. When the power of the city magistrates and councils was decaying during the time of the barbarian invasions, the population of the cities grouped themselves around the bishops as their natural defenders and the counts never gained in the cities as much power as the bishops. The king nominated the bishops and the royal nomination was more and more equivalent to election. He frequently chose pious monks or ecclesiastics, but the royal influence in elections tended to bring many worldly men into the episcopate. On the whole, however, in spite of all corruptions, the Church speaking through brave and faithful bishops, was the only strong influence for justice and mercy during the Merovingian period.

When the Franks invaded, all freemen among them were equal, but, under the long rule of the Merovingian kings, there grew up a class of nobles who made the titles of count and duke, originally marks of service to the king, patents of permanent family rank. Many of the members of the ancient Roman senatorial families went into the Church and their families died out. Others intermarried with great Frankish landowners or state functionaries to form the Merovingian nobility. This new social and political caste gained power and authority over their non-noble neighbours by the spread of economic and social customs already known in different forms and by different names in Roman times.

The process of recommendation, which we have already seen, continued. The patron takes the name of *seigneur* or lord; the man who recommends his person and surrenders his land begins to be called, towards the end of the seventh century, *vassus*: a word which was employed for nearly a thousand years to describe the central relationship of the feudal social organization. This process of recommendation in exchange for protection, steadily increased the power of the *seigneur* and the number of peo-

ple dependent on great landowners increased. Grants of the use of a piece of land for a term of years, began to be made simply on the request of a freeman who was willing to work it. These concessions out of pure good will ("per beneficium") were most common from the huge estates of monasteries and came to be known as benefices. This benefice, afterwards called a fief, became, like recommendation, producing the vassus or vassal, one of the chief elements in the development of the feudal organization.

Both of these relationships show certain similarities with things in Roman customs, but the immunity, which was to become the third chief element in the development of the feudal method of social organization, was something new. Although the great landowners had complete, or all but complete, jurisdiction over the slaves or half-slaves of their estate, the count, or his representatives, could enter upon it to punish crimes and even to protect the coloni from oppression. Some of the *seigneurs* obtained, therefore, from the king an immunity from visits by any royal functionary, which made the *seigneur* sole judge, tax collector, and mobilizer of the military force for his estate.

The two causes of this dissipation of royal power, which brought into being a strong aristocracy, were the lack of understanding of the idea of the state and the pressing need of buying adherents in the intermittent civil wars. So there was built up beside the royal power an aristocratic power which grew stronger as the kingship declined.

Merovingian kings continued to wear crowns for a hundred and twelve years after the death of Dagobert, but the family fell into a decline. The stock was worn out and its physical decadence showed in short lives given up to indolence and debauchery. No one was much tempted to kill them because they counted for so little. Historians

have given them the name of *rois faineants*: "Do-nothing kings." A chronicler who saw the fall of the dynasty wrote: "For a long time it had lacked all real energy. The king, with flowing hair and beard, sat on the throne and played at being king in public ceremonies, answering ambassadors apparently of his own will, but, in fact, saying what he had been told to say. . . . The administration of the kingdom was carried on by the mayor of the palace, who did everything both at home or abroad."

On all large estates there was a steward. The king also had his steward or mayor of the palace, who rose from being head of the king's household to be superintendent of the kingdom and master of his royal master.

CHAPTER VI

CHARLEMAGNE TRIES TO RESTORE THE ROMAN STATE

For a time the office of mayor of the palace served as a sort of connection between the royal power and the power of the aristocracy, for the mayor was at once the chief officer of the king and the highest member of the nobility. But the rival families of the mayors of the palace who became supreme in the four kingdoms, kept up for about fifty years a dull and bloody internecine strife. Then there begins to emerge out of the senseless confusion something that looks like a continuous line of growth. For more than two generations Pippin II and his son Charles governed the entire Merovingian Kingdom.

They had much fighting to do to maintain their position. The most conspicuous battle, which earned for Charles the nickname of Martel (the Hammer) was in central Gaul. The Arabs, a hundred years after the death of their prophet, Mohammed, in 632, had conquered Asia Minor, Syria, Persia, the whole of North Africa and Spain except the northwestern mountains. They crossed the Pyrenees, but Charles Martel beat them in 732 near Poitiers. The victory was not as overwhelming as it appears on the pages of a chronicler who wrote fifty years later that the Christians slew 375,000 infidels with a loss of only 1,500. But it was the first great disaster the Mohammedans had met in a century of conquest and they abandoned their tents in the night and withdrew. If they had gone as far north of Poitiers as they had come from the Straits of Gibraltar, they would have reached Scandinavia and they might have fulfilled the boast of one of their earlier leaders that, after conquer-

ing western and central Europe, he would cross the Alps and read the Koran from the altar of St. Peter.

A century after Charles Martel's death, a chronicler tells the vision of a saint whose life he was writing. The saint saw Charles in hell, and an angel explained that he had to suffer punishment for the sins of all those who had given lands to support the servants of Christ, but whose pious intent had been frustrated by his confiscations. Recovered from his swoon, the saint ordered the sinner's tomb to be opened, when a dragon came out of it leaving it black and charred with fire. "This is written," the chronicler adds, "that all readers may know the righteous damnation which awaits him by whom the property of the Church has been taken away." But, in spite of this posthumous bad reputation, it is plain that Charles Martel remained to the end of his life on very friendly terms with the Pope, who sent him the chains worn by St. Peter and the key of his tomb. When the son of Charles Martel, Pippin, nicknamed the Short, determined to dethrone the last of the weak Merovingian kings in whose name his grandfather and father had governed, he sent an embassy to ask the Pope what he thought. The Pope answered, "It would be better that he who had the power should be called king." So in 751 Pippin "by the election of all the Franks, the submission of the nobles and the consecration of the bishops," was placed upon the throne and the nominal king, his flowing royal locks shorn, was put into a monastery.

Two years later the Pope crossed the Alps and at St. Denis consecrated Pippin the Short to the office of king. None of the Merovingian kings had been consecrated and the ceremony helped to give the usurping dynasty a new divine sanction to replace the authority of antiquity. The Pope also conferred on Pippin the title of Patrician (or protector) of Rome and The Church. The newly consecrated King not only took the robe and the ring of

CARNEGIE LIBRARY
LIVINGSTONE COLLEGE
SALISBURY, N. C. 28144

this honorary office, but he also actually assumed its duties and successfully defended the head of the Church of the old Western Empire against the last of the northern barbarians who had settled forcibly within its bounds. Twice he crossed the Alps, forced the submission of the Lombards, and compelled them to cede to the Pope the cities they had conquered. The keys of these cities Pippin sent to Rome by an envoy who laid them on the tomb of St. Peter.

Pippin the Short was succeeded by his sons, Charles and Carloman. Carloman died three years after his father, and Charles ruled for forty-seven years. The title of "the great," given to successful rulers, has seemed so inseparable from him that it has become a part of his name Charlemagne. He was essentially a soldier and no year of his reign was entirely free from war. The object of most of these wars, was what is meant by a much abused modern phrase, "a scientific frontier." His inherited kingdom was bordered on the north, east, and south by hostile peoples who would have been glad to destroy utterly the realm whose borders they intermittently plundered.

Although it is true that the predominant motive of Charlemagne's wars was to defend his inheritance, they largely increased the extent of his kingdom. At the call of the Christians living in the mountains of northwest Spain, he crossed the Pyrenees to attack the Saracens. His first campaign was not successful and on his retreat the rearguard, under the command of one of his chief officers, fell into an ambush of the Basques and perished to the last man. This disaster took hold of the popular imagination and was committed to writing centuries later as the Song of Roland. Other expeditions established the Spanish boundary; a line south of the Pyrenees and parallel to them, extending from the Mediterranean to the Bay of Biscay.

On the north Charlemagne pushed his border by the conquest of the Saxons to the base of the Danish peninsula and a little beyond the river Elbe. This was a terrible task of many years with repeated revolts. Charlemagne was gracious to those who accepted the result of the first wager of battle, but he had no scruples about vengeance upon those who renewed the struggle after submission. In one day he cut off the heads of four thousand such "rebels."

For eight years he fought the Avars, a heathen people on the middle Danube. Their great fortress, the Ring, was taken at last by his son. It was circular with nine walls each twenty feet high. The treasures of gold, silver, jewels and precious vestments, largely the accumulations from repeated plundering of churches, were sent to Charlemagne, who gave a part to the Pope and distributed the rest among his chief officers.

For each of these conquests he established a "march" or boundary, more or less defended by fortresses. Each march was commanded by an officer known as the Margrave, or Count of the border. To defend his Atlantic coasts against the ravages of the Norse pirates coming in their small open boats from the Baltic and to check the Saracens of the south, Charlemagne built a fleet and shipyards, and, as long as he lived, these swift moving freebooters did comparatively little damage in Gaul.

The successful effort to keep out of Western Europe surrounding peoples who were eager to make plundering attacks upon it, naturally recalled the ideal of the great emperors who had held firm the borders between barbarism and civilization. It does not seem to have come about so much by the planning of Charlemagne, as by the common consent of the heads of church and state, that, while he knelt before the altar of St. Peter's on Christmas Day 800, in the thirty-third year of his reign, a diadem was suddenly placed on his head by the Pope while the people

hailed him with shouts, "Charles Augustus crowned of God, great and peace-giving Emperor of the Romans." The Eastern Empire sent from Constantinople an acknowledgment of his title and from the Caliph Haroun al Raschid in far off Bagdad came silks, perfumes, a magnificent clock and an elephant, which brought its great bulk and its great name, Aboulabasand, all the way to Charlemagne's capital at Aix la Chapelle. For Charlemagne's name went to the ends of the earth and his figure towers above the arid wastes of history before and after him, like some Egyptian monument in the desert.

Charlemagne made little change in the political system he inherited. He continued the custom which had grown up at the end of the Merovingian period of an assembly every spring. Theoretically these assemblies represented the whole people. In fact they consisted of the bishops, abbots, counts, and other great *seigneurs*, with their trains of followers and dependents. Only the leaders met in the council chambers, usually in two bodies, laymen and ecclesiastics. They gave advice to the Emperor on questions prepared by him, and apparently he had little trouble in getting the assembly to endorse any decision he had already formed. They approved the new laws or capitularies he issued from time to time; six hundred and forty-five in all.

The most important part of Charlemagne's civil administration was the Church. Bishops carried much of the local administration of the Empire and his royal council was filled with able ecclesiastics. Ten years before Charlemagne's father took the crown, the great missionary Boniface in a letter to the Pope, described the condition of the Church in the Merovingian realm as very dark. No council had met in eighty years. The clergy led lives openly scandalous. The bishops were brawling drunkards, fighting in battle and shedding with their own hands the blood of their fellow men. Charle-

magne carried on a reform of the Church begun under his father, according to which a council was to meet every year. There was to be a bishop in every city and every priest of his diocese must report to him twice a year. The monastic orders must keep their rule strictly, no ecclesiastic could bear arms or hunt with either hawk or hound.

Charlemagne supported with all his power and authority the missionary enterprise of the Papacy, especially among the Saxons, where, as fast as he extended his conquests, he established bishoprics, built churches and installed priests. That this effort to convert the heathen should add force to persuasion, was taken as a matter of course. If these heathen Saxons, they reasoned, did not have brains or character enough to accept the gospel when it was preached to them, of course the Emperor, anointed of God through the head of the Church, should make them do what was for the good of the world. They might mourn for awhile over the false gods of their fathers, but they would rejoice to all eternity when they found themselves saved from hell by the kindly cruelty of the servants of God. Besides the bishops and counts upon whose advice the Emperor relied would have agreed with him that it was extremely dangerous to allow two religions in the Empire.

This corrupting heresy that it was the duty of the Church to ask the executioner to defend the truth, and the false political maxim that two worships cannot safely exist in the same state, were to fill the history of Europe with hate and cruelty for a thousand years. Acting upon these two falsehoods, Charlemagne assimilated the heathen Saxons to the Imperial Church not only by preaching but by law. The Saxon who ate meat in Lent or "scorned to come to baptism and wished to remain a pagan" was punished like an open rebel with death. But a priest had power to commute the sentence of any one who confessed

to him and did penance for "any of these mortal crimes."

Probably the part of Charlemagne's work which had the most lasting influence upon history, was what he did for education. After the barbarians had mastered Gaul in the fifth century, the great Gallo-Roman municipal schools were gradually submerged by the rising tide of ignorance. Before the end of the century a cultivated Gallo-Roman literator writes a friend with plaintive humour, "How can I write six feet hexameters when I am surrounded by seven feet barbarians?" A century later Gregory of Tours laments, "Alas for our age! for the study of letters has perished among us, and no man is to be found who can commit to writing the events of our time." Such teaching as survived found refuge in schools kept up by bishops, or the abbots of some of the two hundred and forty monasteries which existed south of the Loire by the end of the sixth century.

As the Church became corrupted under the *faineant* Merovingian kings, even these schools failed and the ancient province of Gaul became intellectually all but completely barbarized. Teaching threatened to become a lost art and the entire deposit of knowledge which one generation can hand down to another was about to disappear. The Church had grown enormously in wealth, but, perhaps for that very reason, she neglected even those functions as a teacher which had fallen to her. The reform of the Church gave Charles his chance to use again the bishops and monasteries in his plan to restore the art of teaching to a place among the arts practised by man, and to prevent the entire loss of the intellectual treasures of the past.

A condensed paraphrase of the famous letter which in 787 he sent throughout his whole realm will make plain his intention: "Be it known to you that we desire to have in the bishoprics and monasteries committed by Christ to our care, not only a holy life but also the study of let-

ters. . . . During past years we have often received letters from different monasteries in which the sentiments, though pious, were expressed in uncouth language and we have come to fear lest those who cannot write correctly may be unable to read aright the Holy Scriptures. So we exhort you not to neglect the study of letters. . . . It is our wish that you should be pious in heart, pure in act, eloquent in speech, so that all may be edified in beholding you and instructed in hearing you."

Charlemagne instituted what was known as the palace school, which followed the court on its journeys. It was meant to include among its pupils noble youths destined for careers in church or state. The teachers he sought from abroad and he finally put at its head one of the most distinguished scholars of his day, the Englishman Alcuin. He based the instruction of the school on the seven liberal arts, the trivium, grammar, rhetoric, logic; and the quadrivium, arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy. What he knew about these was summed up in the compendiums of Bœthius, Cassiodorus and Isidorus, the first two, writers dead for over two hundred years and the last, a Spanish bishop of the seventh century who had been given by his contemporaries the title of the "light of Spain"; which, as a modern writer remarks, is "a convincing proof of how dark Spain was." What Alcuin knew about the seven liberal arts based on these compendiums was not very much and the eager questions of Charlemagne often embarrassed him. When the King asked why the planet Mars had disappeared for a year, Alcuin had to hide his ignorance under a joke. He said the sun had detained the planet in its course, but finally had to let it go because he was afraid of the constellation of the lion. For there is a certain childlike quality about the accounts of the instruction of the great English scholar which marks the declension from the age of Cicero and Virgil. Nor did Alcuin intend a renascence of the pagan classics. As a

youth he had studied Virgil and often quotes him, but he came to shrink from his works as a collection of "lying fables," unfit to be read by those training for the priesthood, whose reading ought to be the Scriptures and the fathers of the Church.

During the life of Charlemagne his plans for maintaining schools in every monastery and bishopric were followed and the bishop of at least one large diocese ordered his clergy to open a school in every village "for the free instruction of all children."

The efforts of Charlemagne did not produce a notable positive result. How was that possible under the circumstances? But at a time of crisis he protected the sacred treasure against the perils which beset its transmission from age to age. When total darkness threatened he kept the flickering lamp alight.

Historians speak perhaps truly of a renascence of art under Charlemagne, but the renascence remained still rather barbarous and had a very feeble and short life. In one art only did the Carolingian artists reach supreme excellence—calligraphy. The schools of copyists promoted and patronized by Charlemagne, produced, in the ninth century, written pages whose beauty has never been surpassed.

It is difficult to trace the history of architecture from 500 to 950 because very few buildings of that time have survived. There are two reasons for this. (1) The Northmen intermittently burnt churches all over the western part of Charlemagne's empire for a hundred years after his death. (2) Burnt churches were rebuilt with great haste and little skill. Nevertheless, in spite of the paucity of examples, the experts feel that from such instances as the churches at Cravant and St. Généroux, the remains of St. Pierre at Jumièges, the crypt of St. Laurent at Grenoble, Saint Paul at Jouarre and the baptistery of St. Jean at Poitiers, we can trace the essential character

of Carolingian architecture. It found its models in Italy, usually the plain rectangular basilica with a roof of wood, but sometimes polygonal with a cupola, or square with exterior chapels. In the northern parts of the realm builders eagerly adopted the new fashion of transepts making cruciform churches; a fashion probably developed by them.

One of Charlemagne's great pleasures was building. He constructed a wooden bridge, five hundred paces long, over the Rhine at Mayence and, when it burnt, started to replace it by a bridge of stone. He built three great palaces, and a chapel for one of them at Aix la Chapelle which still survives, though it had to be restored after it was burnt by the northern pirates. It excited more admiration among his contemporaries than modern critics think justified. It was an imitation of the church of St. Vitale at Ravenna, and Charlemagne had the permission of the Pope to bring from buildings in Ravenna marble columns, mosaics and bronze ornaments.

No painting and only one mosaic of the Carolingian period have survived, which suggests that they were not very numerous, considering the large number we have that are six or seven hundred years older. Enough sculpture of the period has survived to show that the wielders of the chisel had a barbaric lack of skill in portraying figures in three dimensions, whether human or animal, but their decorative panels of vine leaves, conventionalized flowers, interlacing bands, etc., are often attractive, though the technique is rude and hard.

Charlemagne had the walls of his palace decorated with historical scenes. He assigned biblical subjects to the churches and forbade in them all pagan allegories or mythological personages. It seems a suggestion of the lack of craftsmen at the time, that his body, when it was entombed in his chapel, was laid in a classic sarcophagus decorated with a bas relief of the rape of Proserpine.

What Charlemagne did was to accomplish after nearly four centuries the wish attributed to Athaulf the Visigoth "to restore the Roman state by Gothic vigour." But the dilution of the capable peoples which Rome had molded into Romania had become so extreme that it was impossible to reconstitute in reality the vanished greatness of the past. With all his efficiency, Charles, when put alongside of an Augustus or a Trajan, was a great barbarian and his work was only a rude imitation of what they had wrought by the genius of that race, on whom, above all others, was bestowed the gift to rule peoples and give law to the world.

PERIOD 3

TRIUMPHANT BARBARISM FOLLOWED BY FEUDALISM

814–1108

A. The Decay of the Carolingian Empire. Hugh Capet Crowned King of the Franks, etc., 814–987.

B. Feudalism Follows Anarchy as a Solvent of the State.

C. Signs of Energy Capable of Making a State and a New Civilization.

(1) Romanesque Architecture.

(2) Scholasticism.

(3) The Conflict of the Church Against Feudalism. The Crusades.

Chapters VII, VIII and IX.

CHAPTER VII

THE DECAY OF THE EMPIRE OF CHARLEMAGNE

The Empire of Charles carried in it the germs of immediate degeneration and final dissolution. Gaul was not to be the corner stone of a new Empire, nor was France to develop along the Roman way. Rather, through centuries of darkness and struggle, she was to work out her own salvation and become a leader toward a new civilization which now dominates not only the Roman world, but three continents unknown to antiquity and has spread its political ideas to the leading nations of Asia.

After Charlemagne died in 814, no one of his descendants was able to sway his scepter. His futile son had scarcely mounted the throne before his sons began to fight for immediate shares in their prospective inheritance from their grandfather. Within the realm, kingdoms were made and Charlemagne's greedy and ambitious descendants struggled for them. Their boundaries were shifting and their number changing. At one time there were seven. One of these rival kings was called emperor; but there was no co-operation between them except when two united to rob a third.

The most permanently influential distribution of crowns and lands made by them after internecine war, was that of the treaty of Verdun in 843. This divided the Empire into three parts, of which the western division may be assumed as the nucleus of modern France and the eastern division as the nucleus of modern Germany. The king of the central narrow strip running across the map of Europe disregarding all natural boundaries, was also to be emperor and therefore his kingdom was planned to

include Aix la Chapelle and Rome; the two capitals of the Empire. It took from its rulers the name Lotharingia which survives in Lorraine. Far from being the base for any national growth it included parts of six modern states.

One real and lasting distinction there was between the eastern and western sections of the Empire: language. The eastern Franks of what we may call Germania had not assimilated the spoken Latin of the Empire to form a Romance speech. But the Frankish inhabitants of the Western Kingdom had so far abandoned their native tongue that they transmitted to modern French in words of German origin, less than one-tenth of its vocabulary. The difference is recorded for us in the double oath taken in 843 by the kings of the eastern and western kingdoms in order that their soldiers might understand it. The beginning of the oath in Frankish was as follows: Pro Deo amur et pro christian poblo, et nostro commun salvament, dist di en avant, in quant Deus savir et podir me dunat, si salvarei eo cist meon fradre Karlo, etc. The oath in Germanic began as follows: In Godes minna ind um tes christanes folches ind unser bedher gealtnissi fon thesemo dage frammordes so fram so mir Got gewizei indi madh furgibit so hald ih tesan minan bruodher, etc. A comparison with an English version of these few words enables the reader to see the great difference of the speech of the different parts of the Empire. "For the love of God and for the common safety and that of Christian people from this day forward with all God has given me of knowledge and power I will protect this my brother Charles, etc."

The struggle over the Empire of Charlemagne among his descendants went on for nearly two hundred years, while upon the weakened Empire poured new barbarian hordes seeking slaves and plunder. The Magyars rode in from the east on their swift ponies. From the south

came the Saracens attacking the Mediterranean shores. From the Scandinavian lands came the savage Northmen whom the English called Danes. In their open boats they ravaged the whole coast, slaughtering, plundering and burning. On their long voyages they sacked almost every important city within a hundred miles of the sea, and the kingdom and the empire were impotent to stop them.

Finally they went through the change made by other barbarian peoples before them: they ceased to be mere pillagers and asked to become settlers. In 911 Charles the Simple, who wore the crown of the Western Kingdom for twenty-five years, granted to the powerful freebooter chief Rollo, the duchy of Normandy "to hold and transmit to his heirs to the end of time." This was nothing new, however, for, since the middle of the ninth century, the offices of counts and dukes had been rapidly becoming hereditary and their territories were looked on as beneficia belonging to the family. There is a story that the pirate about to become a duke, told one of his chiefs to kneel and take the oath of fealty for him and that the clownish barbarian pretended to stumble and upset both the throne and the King on it. However that may be, Rollo kept his oath. He and his leading men also accepted baptism. Perhaps because it was not forced upon them, the Normans received the doctrine of the Church with avidity and Normandy became rapidly covered with churches and monasteries. Indeed of all the barbarians who came into the bounds of the ancient Empire during four hundred years, none showed such capacity for rapid assimilation of new things as these Norsemen.

The last Carolingian to have real authority in the Western Kingdom was Charles the Simple, and he died in prison, where he had been cast by a coalition of some of the great counts and dukes, now changed from officers

appointed by the crown into independent landed magnates.

The greatest line of these magnates was that of the descendants of Robert the Strong, who about the middle of the ninth century had been made Duke of the country between the Seine and the Loire because of his success in fighting the Northmen. His son and grandson had both at intervals assumed the crown and fought the Carolingian kings. Robert's great-grandson, Hugh, had been made Duke of the Franks, an office not dissimilar in power to that of the mayors of the palace. Hugh left a son named Hugh Capet. When the direct line of the Carolingian kings of the Western Kingdom died out, leaving an uncle as sole heir, the bishops and magnates met and decided that kingship was not hereditary, but that "we ought to raise to that dignity not the man distinguished by nobleness of birth alone, but by wisdom and magnanimity." Then they elected Hugh Capet, who was acknowledged by the Emperor. Thus, in 987, after a rule of two hundred and thirty-six years the Carolingian dynasty ended.

CHAPTER VIII

FEUDALISM FOLLOWS ANARCHY AS A SOLVENT OF THE STATE

The permanent change from a Carolingian dynasty to another was not of any particular historic significance. The line was not even new, for two of Hugh's ancestors had for a time worn the crown. It did not mean, as might have been inferred from the language used at the assembly which chose him king, the substitution of elective for hereditary monarchy: because, among the descendants of Hugh Capet, the eldest son of the former king succeeded to the throne of his fathers during more than three centuries. Nor was it the substitution of national ideals for imperialistic ideals by which the successors of Charlemagne, Emperor of the West, became kings of France. The great-great-grandson of Hugh Capet was on the throne, before we see on the pages of a royal biographer the faint suggestions of national feeling in connection with the name France. Hugh Capet would have rejected the title King of France as too narrow a limitation of his authority. France was still used in the sense of the Duchy of France; the territory centring around Paris. Hugh was crowned King of the Franks, Bretons, Aquitanians, Goths, Spaniards and Gascons.

His reign, and that of his three immediate descendants, had little influence upon the development of government and society within the bounds of their realm. If Hugh the Great, Robert II, the Pious, Henry I and Philip I the Fair, had been replaced by rulers with other nicknames, it is difficult to imagine that the course of French history would have been altered. It was to the advantage of

the dynasty that the reigns of its first four members averaged thirty years, but they were not able to make use of these years to impose any governmental policy upon the complex of jealous peoples they nominally ruled. Although they were far from being like the *rois faineants,* weak scions of a degenerating stock, they had to be content with the function of figurehead of a state which was hardly a state at all. During this century and a quarter, as for a century and a half before it, the annals of the palace have little to do with the history of France.

In the period which elapsed between the death of Charlemagne and the accession to the throne of Louis the Fighter, approximately the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries (814–1108) there are three main lines which concern the development of the state and nation of France. These are the formation of feudalism and its practical substitution for government; the development, by an unconscious common effort for artistic expression, of romanesque architecture; an attempt at the rationalization of theology which produced scholasticism. All three of these, feudalism, the romanesque style and scholasticism, were or were to become, common to many parts of Western Europe. But, in each, either the most original impulse towards development, or its most typical form, is to be found among the ancestors of the French.

In each of these processes the development was away from classic tradition. Feudalism indeed incorporated features similar to those found in late Roman social organization, but fully developed feudalism could have been established as a governmental system only among people who had forgotten all Roman ideas in regard to the nature of a state. The romanesque style, based on the round arch, so characteristic of the architecture of the Romans that it was long regarded as their invention, developed the pointed arch and blossomed into the gothic architecture absolutely antipodal to the buildings of imperial

Rome. The impulse of scholasticism, associated in the earliest stages with schools of Latin literature and using classic dialectic as its chief weapon, developed methods which would have seemed as strange to Cicero and Virgil as they do to us. All three of these lines of development, therefore, and the results produced by the generations of men who followed them, are signs, direct or indirect, of the completion of the process begun in the fifth century through which the influence of the civilization of the Mediterranean was extremely enfeebled by the end of the tenth century. In the absolute sense there were no Dark Ages, but there are reasons for accepting the opinion of many historians that the darkest of the ages was the tenth.

That process of barbarizing had been arrested by the work of the early Carolingians. But it had begun again in the devastation which the boats of the Norsemen and the Saracen pirates in the west and the ponies of the Magyars from the east, carried to all parts of the renewed Empire. The material ruin wrought by these fierce raiders, which was about at its worst from 850 to 950, had not been the most pernicious effect of their invasion. The misery and disorder of the times, under which a feeble government broke down, drove all but entirely from men's minds the ideas which underlay the Roman conception of a state. Nor did any part of the organs of administration which the Merovingians and Carolingians had created or adapted, survive the great disaster, except the ideal of the consecrated king, anointed with divine authority by the Church to be her defender and the champion of justice for the poor and oppressed. The ideal of this office, a sort of Christian pendant to the ideal of the apotheosized emperor, the genius of the Roman state, was accepted before feudalism developed. Those who were borne to power by the development of feudalism tolerated the royal office, although they gave the king to whom they rendered lip service no power to control their lives.

But the survival of the royal ideal as a sort of immaterial archeological remnant, was of the greatest historical importance. The kingship became, later, the centre around which, in most of the countries of modern Europe, a state formed. If the ideal of this office had not survived, it is difficult to imagine how modern nations would have developed.

Feudalism was the result of a change in social custom which took place during the ninth and tenth centuries in France, the Spanish kingdoms and Germany. It was carried by French conquerors into southern Italy and England after the middle of the eleventh century, spread in the next two centuries to the eastern states of Europe and in the fourteenth century to the Baltic countries. The wisest writers do not think they are able to trace the formation of feudalism in all its details, because historians generally are agreed that the tenth century is the most obscure in French history.

By the eleventh century feudalism in France was fully formed. Speaking in the most general terms, this meant, first, the disappearance in practice of the functions of central government, and, secondly, the exercise of many functions of the state by holders of land. These *seigneurs* were not farmers in our sense. They never worked themselves on the land whose possession gave them authority over other men. They became a hereditary caste, whose chief pleasure and whose most necessary occupation was, during the tenth century and long after it, fighting. There were also many ecclesiastical *seigneurs*, archbishops, bishops and abbots, officers of the Church, who were ex-officio holders of land, which gave them also certain privileges and governmental functions. Although there were in the tenth century a certain number of free farmers owning their small farms in fee simple and under the control of no lord, they formed a small proportion of the population and were generally in communities in

mountainous regions like the Pyrennean slopes and Switzerland.

By the beginning of the ninth century most of the land of Gaul was held in large estates: very much as the land in some states of South America, or in certain parts of Mexico, is now held. Many of the communes, the basal unit of political organization of modern France, represent and record in their names, an ancient estate. These estates of the ninth century in Gaul were generally divided into two parts; one usually much larger than the other. On the smaller part the master built his manor house and worked it, usually through a bailiff or superintendent. This piece of land around the manor house is often spoken of as the domain, though the word is also used for the entire estate.

The master's land was worked at first by slaves who gradually gave place to serfs; half free people attached to the soil, who could not leave it, but who could not be put off it. In the ninth and tenth century the largest part of the population were serfs. What they paid to the lord was supposed to be regulated by custom, sometimes recorded in documents. If they tried to run away the neighbours were supposed to arrest and return them and they could not marry off the estate without the lord's permission; which usually had to be bought. The economic situation was, however, a strong check on oppression of the serfs. There was more land than hands to work it, and to drive serfs to flight meant not only danger for them but ruin for the lord.

Alongside of the serfs and mingled with them, were the free villains or dwellers on the villa. These were renters who usually farmed on shares, though sometimes the rent was fixed: in such items, for instance, as "three chickens and fifteen eggs, four measures of wine, the work of one ox on so many perches of land," or other fixed amounts of labour, etc. Free villains had the right to leave the

land, though there were practical difficulties in the way of using that right. On the contrary the lord could not, unless he acted contrary to the custom, deprive the free villain of his leasehold or prevent him from selling it or bequeathing it as he wished. Freedom was hereditary as serfdom was.

Besides these two main classes, serfs and free villains, there was another much less numerous class known as hospites. These were labourers, unattached to any soil. They seem to have shared the adventurous and roving disposition of those tamers of forests, who during the last century pushed our American frontier so rapidly westward and northward. There were still, especially in the north of Gaul, huge forests of fertile land and, during the tenth century, these feudal frontiersmen felled great stretches of woods to make room for a population constantly crowding the food supply. Later the descendants of these unattached labourers, who liked the axe better than the plough, became free villains or even sank to the condition of serfs.

Upon this fundamental economic situation of land held in great estates, exploited by seigneurs through serfs and villains who had certain rights in the soil, there supervened a situation some of whose elements can be traced back to Roman times—feudalism. Historians do not know exactly how this happened, but the general process may be illustrated in short space by considering the condition or relations indicated by four words: recommendation, fief, vassalage, immunity.

Recommendation was an ancient custom, by which a man put himself and his property under the protection of a more powerful neighbour. It tended to increase rapidly the wealth and power of the owners of large estates while it afforded to their weaker neighbours a defense and a refuge against the miseries of the times. *Fief* was the name given from the beginning of the tenth century in

France to a piece of land of considerable extent (frequently already provided with serfs and villains) granted under certain conditions to a vassal. A *vassal* was probably originally a free attendant of a seigneur, but the name seems to have been gradually applied to his military guards who became his comrades. Gradually, these vassals, instead of living at the manor of the seigneur, came to be established in their own houses on their own fiefs. Originally, not every vassal had a fief, but finally no one could hold a fief without becoming a vassal.

The tenure of a fief by a vassal was, by the tenth century, sharply distinguished from villain tenure. The serf and the villain paid for the use of their holdings in money, in work or in produce. But the vassal who held a fief, by what came to be called noble tenure, paid chiefly in the willingness to shed his blood for his lord and to help counsel him in the administration of justice. The relation was not commercial but personal. So all lords and vassals, no matter how rich or poor, came to be considered as belonging to the same class. The great seigneur could marry the daughter of a weak fief holder without making a misalliance, whereas the son of a great seigneur and a woolcarder was called by the King in the twelfth century "a bastard and not the equal of the barons of Flanders." This social equality among the vassals and their lords was helped by the fact that their relationship became more and more military. War was a great leveller. When a man rode at another brandishing a heavy iron mace, any feeling of social superiority had a tendency to disappear and the affair in hand had to be settled on manhood's simple level.

The vassal was given his fief by a process called investiture which was preceded by homage and fealty. The vassal did homage bareheaded and without arms by kneeling before his lord; putting his hands into his lord's hands, and declaring himself his man. The lord raised

the vassal and kissed him on the mouth. The vassal then swore fealty or faithfulness to all a vassal's duties. Though this oath was broken not infrequently, shame always attached to breaking it. For a vassal to strike his lord was regarded as base; to kill his lord was a sacrilegious perfidy from which even very rough men shrank. The vassal was, in the beginning, invested with a fief for life. But fiefs soon became hereditary on the simple condition that the heir would acknowledge the relation by homage and fealty. This change from life to hereditary fiefs was accomplished in France by the end of the tenth century. By inheritance, by grant or even by violence, a vassal might come to hold many fiefs. He might even be lord for some fiefs and vassal for others. Gradually almost all land came to be thought of as fiefs held of higher seigneurs and through them of the king.

Immunity was perhaps the most influential custom in that process of the formation of feudalism which transformed property rights into rights of government. Under the Carolingians, seigneurs got, by purchase, or favour, rights of immunity from the king which prevented the counts or missi from entering and functioning on their estates. This inevitably put into the hands of the immune seigneurs the power of collecting taxes, organizing the military force and administering justice. Hence arose the later custom of erecting a gallows in a prominent place on a fief as the sign of its noble holder's right to hang those dwelling on it convicted of crime. Seigneurs even came to fight over the question who should hang a thief and cases were known where a dead body was stolen by night from one gallows, to be triumphantly strung up on another as a vindication of superior right.

The power of the seigneurs to levy taxes upon those who dwelt on their land was sometimes used to squeeze from them all that could be gotten. Hence the so-called

"evil customs" by which some lords invented rights that ground their serfs and villains to the earth.

The thing which gave the strongest impulse to the development of feudalism was perhaps the fact that the seigneurs became the hereditary professional fighting caste. The crown was growing weaker and weaker at the very time when there was the most desperate need of a strong government. Undefended by the king, the people naturally turned to their local great men for refuge and protection and the seigneurs, doing their duty during the ninth century, won privileges and power, the remnants of which their descendants retained for nearly nine hundred years.

In this development of the holders of land into a military caste, two things played a large part, the château, at first called a *motte* or mound, and the horse. The *motte* was a sort of rough and ready fortification built of earth and wood. Except in some parts of the south, stone was rarely used up to the middle of the eleventh century. A chronicler of the early twelfth century writes: "The rich and noble of that region, being much given to feuds and bloodshed, fortify themselves. They heap up a mound as high as they are able by digging round it a ditch as broad as they can dig. Round the top of the mound they make a palisade of timber with towers set at intervals. Inside they build a citadel (usually a tower). No one can enter the place except by a bridge which starts from the outer edge of the ditch and . . . reaches the flat space on top of the mound."

Within the stockade of such fortresses, the villains and their cattle could find refuge when the alarm came that the swift pirates were off the coast or on the road; for the Northmen or Danes were perhaps the only sailors recorded in history who used horses freely. Not that they fought on horseback. But, when rivers did not lead

their way, they seized horses and moved rapidly to the country they wished to plunder. The old Frankish militia had decayed. It was ill-armed, and very slow. What was needed was a swift-moving force. Hence the great land holders became *chevaliers*, horsemen, and in the armies of Western Europe cavalry came to be considered the only important part. This was another direct contrast to classic tradition, for the legions of highly trained infantry had been the backbone of the Roman armies.

The arms of the *chevalier, ritter,* or knight, were, in the ninth and tenth centuries, very simple. They consisted of a helmet provided with a noseguard and a short tunic, from the shoulders to the waist, called the *byrnie.* At first this was made of leather overlaid with plates or rings of metal but later it was made of chain mail and lengthened to cover the knees. To protect the neck there was the hauberk of chain mail hanging from the helm. A long narrow shield completed the defensive arms of the warrior in early feudal times. Plate armour came in much later and did not displace chain mail until the fifteenth century. The early *chevaliers* used the sword and the lance, sometimes a mace.

The maintenance of a horse and the possession of arms meant property and, for a noble, this implied a landed estate. But the mere possession of an estate did not of itself put any one into the military caste. The young man had to serve an apprenticeship in the use of arms and when he was about twenty he was admitted into the caste of *chevalier* by a ceremony. Chivalry, or the elaborate code, recorded by poets, chroniclers, and romance writers, of manners and sentiments proper for a knight, was a later creation.

Very early, this landed aristocracy composed of great seigneurs and fief holders by noble tenure, had a strong class consciousness. When one of the kings in the begin-

ning of the tenth century became so fond of a certain Haganon that he even seated him at his side in an assembly of the nobles, word was sent that if he did not put Haganon back in the lowly place where he belonged, the favourite would be "hung without mercy." A hundred and fifty years later even the monks of a certain abbey objected to the attempt of their abbot to revive that part of the rule of St. Benedict which required every monk to labour daily for food and raiment. They said: "It is the custom in France for the peasants to carry on the work of husbandry, as it is their business to do, and for servants to perform all domestic offices. God forbid that the peasantry, whose proper lot is daily toil, should abandon themselves to sloth and idle merriment and far be it from illustrious knights, acute philosophers and accomplished scholars, because they have renounced the world and become monks, to be bound to occupy themselves in servile and unbeseeming occupations like vile slaves."

On the other hand there is no class monopoly of courage. Once, when a royal army, after a desperate battle against the northern pirates, was suddenly menaced by new forces, no one among the feudal nobles could be found to carry the royal banner in a second battle; for all were already wounded. A certain Ingon said before them all, "I am of obscure rank; nothing but a groom of the King's stables. I will carry the royal banner, for I know I must die sometime anyway." The King put the standard into his hands and he bore it with such courage that the barbarians were annihilated. The King gave him the château of Blois and a noble wife, for, in the early stages of the formation of feudalism, the fairy tales of the poor boy who won the princess must have had their counterparts in real life. As time went on, however, feudalism became an all but closed caste system.

The hereditary landholders and those ex-officio land-

holders, the clergy (often younger brothers or cousins of the secular fiefholders) acknowledged the king as their overlord, but, if he was distant enough, his authority was merely a name. So far as the fiefholder had any real sovereign it was some more powerful seigneur close by, to whom he was a vassal, or sub-vassal. This replacing of vanished sovereignty by property, produced an enormous number of political units in which landholding was the basis of hereditary right of government over all those who dwelt on the land and the territory over which the early Capetians nominally ruled was, more than any other part of Europe, subdivided into these pseudopolitical units.

When, by the end of the tenth century, the Danish menace had ceased, either because the pirates had been beaten into subjection by feudal arms, or ceased to be pirates and settled in Normandy, the nobility throughout the territory of modern France were so accustomed to war that they kept on fighting among themselves. Their isolated manor houses or châteaux, as the *mottes* came to be called, made it rather easy for life to become monotonous. They had taken up the use of arms, despised by the Gallo-Roman nobles of the fifth century, but they had given up the literary culture of those earlier great landowners. Most of them did not read and could not write. The literary works of the time were produced by the clergy. The nobles had no resources in themselves and a modern writer on chivalry counts up with humour touched with sympathy, sixteen pleasures which a seigneur might enjoy: hunting, fishing, fencing, jousting, playing chess, eating, drinking, listening to the songs of travelling minstrels, watching bear fights, receiving visitors, talking with the ladies, holding his court, walking in his meadows, sitting before the fire, having himself cupped and bled and watching the snow fall. The list omits the greatest of all

his pleasures, fighting, and the organization of society gave him ample chance to enjoy it.

Feudalism ultimately provided plenty of perpendicular lines of authority in ascending hierarchies usually ending in the descendant of a Carolingian official of whom most of the land of a large region was held in fief. But it was deficient in horizontal lines connecting the various grades of fiefholders with each other. Every noble, therefore, felt it his right, as well as his pleasure, to vindicate his own interests against his neighbour who injured him. We call the exercise of this right private war, as if it were equivalent to modern riot. But it did not seem to those who used it anything but the natural consequence of his position as one who had the rights of government on his own fief. There was private taxation, private justice, private military service, why not private war? There was no public force to support general law. If he had suffered wrong from his neighbour, he must right it himself. In consequence war, in the ages we are considering, and for ages afterward, was not the exceptional but the normal thing. There was always somebody fighting within the bounds of the realm which owed ostensible allegiance to the King of the Franks, Bretons, Normans, Aquitanians, etc.

Such local courts as existed did not decide cases upon evidence, but by an appeal to God in one of two forms. The ordeal was carried on under the supervision of the Church. The accused carried hot iron in his hand or plunged it into boiling water. It was then wrapped up for some days. If on being unwrapped it was unhurt God had approved innocence. Trial by battle might be claimed by all villains and by some serfs. These fought with shield and staff. The nobles, who accepted no other form of trial, fought in large lists with the arms of their caste. God was supposed always to defend the right. In the

twelfth century questions of simple fact, for example, a dispute as to whether a certain village belonged to the royal domain or the domain of a great seigneur, were settled by fights between champions.

Feudal, or, as we call it, private war, was often not very destructive of life. The forces engaged in battles were not usually large and the victor preferred to take prisoners in order to get a ransom; which nobles paid on a scale in accord with their rank. One of the regular "aids" due from the holder of a noble fief to his seigneur was a contribution towards his ransom when captured. Even peasants were held for such small ransom as could be extracted from their poverty. One personage alone was, by the twelfth century, thought to be sacred on the field of battle, the king. At the battle of Brémule, early in the twelfth century, a French knight charged the English King and gave him a fierce sword blow on the head which would have killed him but for his hauberk. The chronicler adds: "It was a criminal act to strike the anointed head on which the crown had been placed amid the acclamations of the people praising God." In this battle, one of the most decisive and well known of the generation, the chronicler tells us: "nearly nine hundred knights were engaged. I have ascertained that three only were slain. This happened from their armour and their willingness to spare each other out of the fear of God and the sense of fraternity in arms."

But feudal warfare was fearfully and wantonly destructive of property. What could not be carried away from an opponent's territory, was burnt or destroyed. Notices of pillage and flames, laying waste and famine recur on the pages of the chroniclers more often than fighting. Sometimes also great cruelty was practised; as when a count catching peasants of his enemies' lands cutting wood, chopped off their feet. In consequence of devastation and famine, certain parts of the country

swarmed with wolves to such an extent that those killed in a desperate siege were dug out of the trenches where they had been buried and devoured at night by the prowling beasts.

This intermittent petty warfare was felt to be a curse by all but the noble caste and the mercenary soldiers who often turned brigands when their pay ceased. Beginning with the end of the tenth century the Church tried to bind the chevaliers by oath to cease plundering and burning. Councils of the clergy also organized what was known as the Peace of God. The seigneurs who took the oath of the league which grew out of this effort, swore not to drive off the peasants' cows or horses, nor to hold them to ransom, nor to burn their houses, nor cut down their vines or fruit trees. This league soon grew into a League to Enforce Peace. A militia was organized in many dioceses, including all the inhabitants down to fifteen years of age who were sworn to march under the command of their parish priests against those who plundered the humble or the Church. To this Peace of God there was added, in the eleventh century, the Truce of God. Its idea was to limit by agreement, backed by force, the time in which seigneurs might make war on each other. Their abstract right to fight each other was not called in question. Beginning with Sunday the Truce of God was gradually extended over four days of the week connected with the passion and resurrection of Christ. With the addition of Lent and other holy seasons it consecrated to peace two hundred and eighty odd days of each year. Although blessed for several generations by popes and approved by kings, neither the Peace of God nor the Truce of God did much in France to stop the reign of brutal violence during the tenth, eleventh and twelfth century, and at the end of the twelfth century they had all but disappeared.

The tendency of feudalism was not only toward continuous war and violence, but, actually, towards a sort of

dismemberment of the realm. There were within the realm of the King of the Franks "certainly more than twelve thousand of these political units" whose base was the holding of land or its use by noble tenure. In the eleventh century began a change which reversed the process of subdivision by the grouping together of these small fiefs through war and marriage into larger groups. At the end of the tenth century there were nearly seventy of these greater feudal families, dukes, counts, viscounts, barons or simple seigneurs of large possessions. By the twelfth century, there were about forty of these great feudal houses; each one the centre of a large number of vassals holding fiefs. Their heads were really rulers of independent states or provinces, bound to the crown by an oath of fealty which sat very lightly on their consciences. These countships, or duchies, came under the power of the king only as they were added to the royal domain through the same means by which they had been created. Until the end of the twelfth century, the king was master only on the lands he had inherited from his ancestors, the dukes of the Franks and counts of Paris, and this domain was very far from making him the richest or most powerful seigneur of his realm. An illustration of the power of these feudal magnates is seen in the fact that, about the middle of the eleventh century, the Duke of Normandy mobilized and financed an expedition which conquered England.

Among these great feudatories, bound to the king merely by a ceremony, but entirely free from his control, were the Dukes of Normandy, Brittany, Burgundy and Aquitaine (whose lands were the broadest of the nobles of the kingdom), the Counts of Flanders, Blois, Anjou, and Toulouse. Smaller and less wealthy states within the kingdom, but resting equally on the swords of their rulers, were the counties of Comminges, Foix, Carcasonne, Champagne, and Rodez and the viscounties of

Albi, Nîmes, Narbonne, Agde and Béziers. In addition many bishops and abbots, whose dioceses or monasteries were rich in land or controlled wealthy cities, lived as independent seigneurs with whom the King seldom pretended to interfere.

CHAPTER IX

SIGNS OF ENERGY FIT TO MAKE A NEW CIVILIZATION

Romanesque Architecture—Scholasticism—The Crusades

In spite of the barbarian invasions which promoted the growth of feudalism and the ceaseless civil disorder which grew out of feudalism, the intellectual energy of the people living in the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries within the bounds of modern France, did not perish and it left records of two sorts of activity, in the one case in stone, in the other in books.

The development of romanesque architecture between the end of the ninth and the middle of the twelfth century is something for which no reason can be given. Centuries of such misery and bloodshed would seem to be entirely unfitted for the development of the sense of beauty and the power to express it in the arts of peace. The style was not confined to the soil of France, but men living on the soil of France were the strongest influences in its development and it was their technical inventions, or their skilful application of known but neglected devices of construction, that finally gave to romanesque architects that mastery of the problems they had to solve which was the necessary basis for the creation of stately and beautiful buildings. It seems to be a spontaneous display of that native artistic energy of the people living in the bounds of modern France which finally made them the modern rivals of the Greeks in the creation of beauty in architecture.

It has already been pointed out that few buildings built before the eleventh century survive in France. During the ninth century, the Northern raiders burnt scores of

churches and the feudal wars which followed in the tenth century spread destruction and poverty. The churches that were rebuilt were so badly constructed that they did not last and, as they were roofed with wood and shored by beams, fire destroyed many more. The lack of all efficient means of fighting fire made these catastrophes very common. One convent was burnt with its church six times in two hundred years.

Not long before the end of the tenth century, there began in France a perfect passion for church building which continued for three hundred and fifty years and covered France "with an incalculable number of edifices each of which records a progress over the preceding ones." The patrons of this enormous output of artistic energy were the Capetian kings, especially Robert the Pious (996–1031) and the great feudal nobles like the dukes of Burgundy or Normandy, the counts of Anjou, of Blois, and of Champagne. The bishops did much to favour this movement especially in rebuilding the cathedrals, or chief churches of their dioceses. The monks to whose care we owe the survival through the darkness of the ninth and tenth centuries of the chief monuments of classic literature, were also most active carriers of that great architectural development which, in the thirteenth century, finally flowered in splendour in the gothic cathedrals of the Île-de-France.

It is not to be supposed, however, as some have supposed, that the monks were either the architects or the craftsmen of these buildings. We do not know the names of the architects of most of these great romanesque churches of France. But a few do record the names of their designers. Among these there is not a single name of a monk and there is no reason to believe that any but a very exceptional abbot or brother of a monastery was either an architect or a skilled craftsman in stone.

The problem which these architects had to solve was

how to produce a fire-resisting roof. They did this by vaulting the building in stone and mortar. "The most characteristic feature of romanesque architecture is the introduction of vaults into the churches." The easiest way to do this was to construct a rounded roof in the shape of half a cylinder and as long as was necessary, like a succession of round arches put side by side. Any builder who could make a plain round arch could use this plan and the traditions of Roman building, which depended upon the use of the round arch, had never died out in France.

But this cylindrical vaulting has one great drawback. It tends to push the walls out of position and cause them to bend and fall outwards. It was this thrust of plain round vaulting which compelled the architects of the tenth and eleventh centuries to work out by practice a professional skill which has never been surpassed among builders. They first tried various devices known to the Romans, bracing the walls on the outside by additional thicknesses of stone disguised as ornamentation, or putting transverse arches underneath the vault. They then went on to vault the side aisles parallel to the main aisle and to superpose upon them vaults in the form of quarter cylinders of which the lower end rested on the side walls of the building and the upper end braced the lower end of the main vault and helped to sustain its thrust. These and other Roman devices, like the intersecting vaults, were surpassed at the end of the eleventh century by the invention of ogives or crossing diagonal arches underneath the intersecting lines formed by the crossed vaults. "This invention of the French architects of the end of the eleventh century solved many problems of construction and was universally used from the end of the twelfth to the middle of the sixteenth century."

A little later the architects of France began to employ frequently a form of arch different from that inherited

from the Romans: the broken or pointed arch. This is made up of two equal segments of two circles with equal radii but different centres. The possibility of forming such an arch is theoretically too evident to have escaped the notice of any people who knew the rudiments of geometry or used compasses. But the romanesque architects were the first to perceive and use freely its advantages in diminishing the lateral thrust. It also opened the way for that great variety and free use of the window which were to become fundamental characteristics of French gothic.

The intellectual energy of the people living in France showed itself also in constructive form during this period in the mental sphere. They took the lead in the formation of that great mass of reasoning, which, applying new methods of instruction and speculation to new materials, produced what we call scholasticism, or the doctrine and method of the men of the schools. These schools were either in monasteries or in episcopal cities under the direction of the bishop. Some of them had no relation to the institutions of Charlemagne. Others were probably the continuers or successors of his establishments, though the relation is not traceable in detail.

Scholastic discussion finally spread over the entire intellectual world. For five hundred years it dominated learning, and continued to exert a strong influence for two hundred years more upon European thinking. The strongest influences in its formation were French, and it seems, in its great dependence upon logic, to express one of the marked characteristics of the intellectual life of the modern French.

Scholasticism grew into the attempt to apply classic logic to Christian theology and its object was to justify faith to reason. Regarded at first with suspicion by the pious, it was then considered the bulwark of truth and the works of the approved scholastic doctors became, more

than the early Christian fathers, or even the New Testament books themselves, the touchstones of orthodoxy.

The best example of the prescholastics who wakened the sleeping world of thinkers and led them in a new direction, is Gerbert a native of southern France who, in the year 999, became Pope under the title of Silvester II. His learning was the wonder of his age and his enemies even accused him of a profund secret mastery of the forbidden art of magic, which gave him control over the services of good and evil spirits. His pupil, Richer, thought him "sent of God to give to Gaul plunged in darkness, a great light." The grateful pupil tells of his master's knowledge of the chief Latin writers, of mathematics and logic. He points out his development of the theory of music to a perfection hitherto unknown. He describes the orrery by which he illustrated the motions of the stars and the abacus by which he taught the mysteries of mathematics. Richer makes plain the scholastic in the universal scholar in his account of the great discussion Gerbert held before the Emperor which lasted "without interruption almost an entire day and fatigued its hearers." His opponent was an envious Saxon scholar and the subject of this long subtle debate was: "Whether the physical sciences were equal to the mathematical sciences and as old as they? or whether mathematics ought to be placed under physics?" In modern terms this seems to be the question whether mathematics is a sort of physics or whether both are kinds of philosophy. The modern mathematician, physicist, and philosopher would hardly think the question worthy the ingenuity and time spent upon its discussion. But the dawn of scholasticism is marked by the comment of the chronicler that the auditors thought "the way to judge easily whether one who passed for a philosopher and professed to be learned in things divine or human, was really a learned man or not, was by the methodical division he made of the whole field of knowledge."

A third sign that there was in the people living during the tenth century within the bounds of modern France a great mass of energy physical, spiritual and intellectual, capable of escaping from the anarchy of unchecked feudalism and moving towards creative development in the formation of a state and a nation, is to be seen in the help some of them gave in the conflict of the Church with feudalism.

Feudalism not only dissolved the power and unity of the state but it threatened to localize and materialize the Church. Except in a few archbishoprics where the king nominated the bishops, the seigneurs, great and small, considered the appointments to ecclesiastical positions on their lands as patronage belonging to them. A duke of Normandy, for instance, made a son Archbishop of Rouen, one nephew Bishop of Bayeux, another Bishop of Avranches, and his grandson Bishop of Lisieux. Against all canonical law, boys of thirteen were named bishops or archbishops. The clergy were forbidden to bear arms, but these feudal ecclesiastics who had nothing of the bishop but the miter and the ring, shared the tastes of their brothers whom they rivalled in pomp, wealth and power. They declined to give up the pleasures of battle and often exchanged the pastoral staff for the mace. Many people feared lest the marriage of priests and bishops should make church positions hereditary, like the fiefs, the counties and the duchies, and so feudalize the Church entirely.

This corruption was of course not universal. There were many good bishops and priests, but the force with which the best churchmen of the tenth and eleventh centuries denounce simony (the buying of church offices) and clerical marriage, show how pressing was the danger that the Church might lose her unity and her spirituality and become feudalized. Nowhere was the disorder of the tenth century more apparent than in Italy where baronial factions fought over the Papacy, which finally sunk so

low that a boy of twelve was made Pope by his family. From this desperate condition the Church was rescued by a powerful Emperor of Germany presiding over a synod of respectable clergymen who deposed three claimants for the tiara and put into office the first of five German popes (1046).

But meanwhile there had been growing within the Church itself, a strong party of reform which became incarnate in Hildebrand; a Roman monk who was the power behind the restored papal throne for many years before he took the tiara as Gregory VII (1073). He was outraged by that dependent position of the Church which was the natural result of the rescue of the Papacy by Imperial force from the condition of being the prize of the struggles of the feudal factions of Rome and Italy. So, after carrying out reforms which restored to a considerable extent her unity and discipline, he asserted first her independence of the secular powers, and then her absolute supremacy. "Come now," he wrote, "O most holy and blessed, Peter and Paul, that all the world may know that if ye are able to bind and loose in heaven, ye are likewise able on earth, to give and to take away empires, kingdoms, princedoms, marquisates, duchies, countships, and the possessions of all men."

These claims to wield the "two swords" of spiritual and temporal power provoked violent resistance on the part of the emperors of Germany, whose realm extended into Italy and included Rome. A conflict between material power and spiritual influence arose, which dragged on for more than two hundred years. In it the Papacy finally won an astonishing victory and the Empire was broken to pieces.

This great conflict did not, until the German Imperial stage of it was nearly over, involve the French crown in any open way which can be described in a few words. On the whole, the popes, during the series of duels with

the emperors, tried to keep on good terms with the extra-imperial kingdoms. It is evident, however, that they wished to bring all the kingdoms of the earth into a sort of feudal relationship to the Papacy as the earthly representative of the divine overlord of the universe. This claim met for more than a century, a very notable degree of acceptance. It was explicitly acknowledged for example, in the Norman Kingdom of Sicily, by the Kings of Aragon and Portugal, by a prince of Bulgaria, and by King John of England. But it was not explicitly urged on the wearers of the more ancient crown of France. Strong popes did not hesitate to condemn Capetian kings for adultery or other moral offenses, but, on the whole, the policy of the Papacy during this colossal struggle with the Empire seems to have been to use the house of Capet as the chief weight in that system of balances to the power of the house of Hohenstaufen it was building in a circle around their Empire. They frequently fled to France and, from that safe refuge, launched their anathemas and interdicts against some anti-pope and his blasphemous supporter, the Emperor.

That this struggle between popes and emperors was essentially a struggle against the feudalization of the Church appears in the very form of its first stage. The subject of controversy was this: when a new bishop or abbot is to be appointed who ought to give him the symbols of his office (the ring, miter, etc.), the representative of the pope or of the emperor? Because of his place in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the bishop or abbot was a subordinate of the pope. His ex-officio function as holder of the fiefs of his diocese or monastery made him a vassal of the emperor. In the last analysis, whose *man* was he, the pope's or the emperor's?

The struggle in France was not intense, direct, dramatic, but rather a series of compromises; until the end of the thirteenth century this question of *investitures* was

rather dodged by both sides and the honours of the ceremony were, in many regions, divided between the civil ruler and the vicar of the pope.

The attempt of the reformed Papacy to check the corruption of the Church by extirpating simony and clerical marriage and even the whole Gregorian programme for complete papal supremacy, was supported in France by a powerful party among the ecclesiastics. This was headed by monks, whose monasteries were freed from the control of the bishops and directly under papal obedience. Indeed, the whole Gregorian movement might be called monastic. It was monks, who had renounced the world and retired to save their souls, who now felt compelled to come out of their cells to save the Church. Gregory VII and most of his immediate successors were monks.

Among the monastic establishments of the age, the Burgundian order, whose centre was at Cluny in north-eastern France, was not only the most powerful of all the orders, but the strongest influence in the world in support of ecclesiastical reform and papal supremacy based on moral control. Next to a pope, an abbot of Cluny was the most powerful personage in the Church and for 250 years, from the foundation of the first monastery in 910 to the beginning of its decline, seven great abbots of Cluny wielded enormous influence. Two of the reforming popes who succeeded Gregory were Cluniac monks, another died at Cluny, where he had taken refuge from his enemies and the conclave which elected another was held at Cluny.

For the Gregorian doctrine that the pope was the absolute and supreme head of human society, the conscience, the brains, the voice of Christendom, the vivid imagination of a friend and successor of Gregory VII found a most dramatic expression. Urban II was born near Rheims of a noble French family, and he had been a subprior of Cluny. At a council in central France, attended

by fourteen archbishops, two hundred and fifty bishops, four hundred abbots, and a great crowd of priests and chevaliers, he preached for the first time the crusade. He called on his hearers to fasten a red cross to their shoulders as a sign of their solemn vow to go in arms to Jerusalem to relieve the Christians of the East and to free the sepulchre of Christ from the infidels. To those who took the cross, the head of the Church promised protection for their property while absent, freedom from all other penance for confessed sins, and, if they died in battle, a certain entry into heaven.

The immediate cause of this appeal to Europe to attack Asia was that the Seljuk Turks had recently conquered Jerusalem. These were much less civilized and tolerant than the Arabs whom they conquered and they interfered with pilgrimages to what was believed to be the tomb of Christ. These pilgrimages had assumed large proportions and in 1065 as many as 12,000 pilgrims had travelled in one company. The Turks also threatened the existence of the Empire of Constantinople; for centuries a bulwark of Europe against Asia.

The success of this strong appeal was enormous. In a year after the great sermon of the Pope, four armies were on their way to Constantinople. These four armies were filled with the feudal fighting class from duke to simple chevalier and contained no king. The overwhelming majority of the crusaders were French. The leaders of one army were the Duke of Normandy and the brother of the King, the Count of Vermandois. Another army, whose ranks were filled by knights from south France, was led by the Count of Toulouse. An army made up of northern French, Lorrainers and Germans marched under the lead of the Duke of Lorraine. The fourth and perhaps the best equipped was led by the eldest son of the Norman conqueror of Sicily. In two years, in spite of jealous quarrels among themselves, twenty thousand

men, the remains of several hundred thousand who had taken the cross, arrived under the walls of Jerusalem.

They were stricken with disease and perishing with thirst, but, by a last effort of courage and zeal, they stormed the strong and heavily garrisoned walls and their leaders knelt in tears before the Holy Sepulchre of the gentle Jesus. They had come here through the temple and the portico of Solomon running red "to their horses' knees with the filthy blood of the Saracens" [Letter to the Pope from a chaplain]. The massacre was renewed in cold blood three days later by the slaughter of their prisoners, old men, women and children. Such an outbreak of passionate cruelty was partly temperamental in a half savage fighting caste; lacking education except in the use of arms. But this hideous spasm of fanaticism had been fostered in advance by the teaching of the clergy, that the butchery of obstinate heretics or infidels was an act well pleasing to God. This immoral idea was the natural result of the acceptance by Christians in the fourth century, from some infernal inspiration, of the doctrine that it was their duty to defend the truth of Christ by force.

By the help of an intermittent stream of new fighters coming from all parts of Europe, and the aid of the ships of Genoa, Pisa and Venice, the crusaders succeeded in establishing a Christian feudal state at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, which was not entirely extinguished for two hundred years.

The crusade was a part of the great effort of the Church to resist and master feudalism, the dominant force in the Western European world in the eleventh century. The chief pleasure of the feudal nobility was fighting. Courage, strength, skill in handling a horse and arms, these were the things he thought most about. These were the qualities his minstrels sang of continually and they contemptuously advised him, if he had not courage

and skill in arms, to lay aside sword and shield and become a monk. The Church tried, somewhat ineffectively, to control this passion for fighting in the Truce of God and the Peace of God. It tried also, by giving a strong religious tinge to the ceremonies of entry into knighthood, to commend to the knights other qualities—like mercy to the poor and weak. Skill in arms, the desire for fame, and a love of fighting were not Christian virtues. The crusade very subtly turned them into Christian virtues by making the vow to march and fight include all penance, blessing the willingness to kill, and, if the crusader was killed, imitating Mohammed by turning his sword into a key of heaven. This was not to make the straight and narrow path easy, for it soon became evident that the crusader must face terrible hardships and dangers, but it was to make it run in the direction of his inclinations. It required no change of heart for him to come to believe that he who took a city with a cross on his shoulder was at least as surely a member of the Kingdom of God as he who conquered his spirit.

Many motives combined to maintain the movement of the crusades intermittently for six generations. The love of adventure, the desire to escape the monotonous life of a feudal castle, the wish to see strange countries, the hope of plunder, the chance to gain fame and lands, the pressure of surplus population in a caste barred by social prejudices against trade and, among urban populations, plans to extend trade, all these played their part. But the amazing success of this idea, at least in its first proclamation by Urban II, is to be explained chiefly by this adjustment of his call to the psychology of the knight to whom he spoke.

That a French pope should first voice this idea of an armed pilgrimage to save the tomb of Christ from the hands of the infidel, was natural, for Charlemagne had received the keys of the Holy Sepulchre from the Sultan,

Haroun-al-Raschid, and, until the eleventh century, his successors were the official protectors of the Christians in the Orient.

Nor is it astonishing that the idea of an armed pilgrimage should receive its earliest and strongest response from Frenchmen. Not many modern Frenchmen are impelled to seek fortune outside of France. Into French colonies there has been no such swarming from the home hive as that which has circled the globe with great English-speaking communities. But, in the latter half of the eleventh century, a curious and adventurous spirit was evidently rife among the fighting classes of the realm which acknowledged the overlordship of the King at Paris. They not only crossed the Pyrenees in large numbers to fight the infidel in Spain, but conquered England (1066) and established the Kingdom of Sicily. A new exercise for saving the soul which gave also a chance for new fiefs in strange lands before they entered heaven, was well fitted to appeal to the restless energy of Frenchmen of the time.

In this effort of the Church to resist feudalization and finally to turn the virtues of the feudal lords into Christian virtues, the kings of France, although some of them built churches and founded monasteries, took little part. When the crusade was launched, indeed, Philip I was under excommunication for bigamy and adultery. The acceptance of the Crusade in France was not a movement led by the crown but a spontaneous outburst of the energy latent in the French nobility.

PERIOD 4

THE RISE OF FRENCH CIVILIZATION

From Louis the Fighter to St. Louis
1108–1226

A. The Formation of the Monarchy.
B. The Growth of the Spirit of France.
Chapters X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV.

CHAPTER X

THE FORMATION OF THE MONARCHY—1108–1223

The old division of history strictly by the reigns of sovereigns, as if the mere shifting of the crown from one perhaps feeble personality to another, was necessarily a large determining factor either in development or degeneration, is outgrown; except among the few obsolete adherents of the ancient theory of the divinity of hereditary royal right.

But the power of a king who had some brains and a strong will was perhaps never quite so great since the fifth century until now, as it was in the period we are considering. On the other hand a weak king has never had a greater power to check the triumph of good over evil than in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It seems, therefore, like an extraordinary accident that hereditary succession should have put on the French throne for an average reign of forty years (throwing out the very brief reign of Louis VIII) four kings, three of whom were forceful personalities. Louis VI, his grandson, Philip II (surnamed Philip Augustus) and his great-great-grandson Louis IX, were all men of intelligence and will power—two of them were great men. They not only did what needed to be done, but they saw, more or less clearly, the goal toward which their efforts and struggles tended. They never hindered, they often helped mightily, the development of the French crown as the centre for the formation of the French state. On the other hand, it is evident that the son of Louis VI, the weak Louis VII, set back the power of the Capetian monarchy a hundred years.

During the eleventh century the control of the Cape-

215446

tian wearers of the crown even over their own family domain had been very imperfect. But, about the beginning of the twelfth century, there came to the throne a king more forceful than any the family had yet produced: Louis VI, nicknamed the Fighter. During the thirty years of his reign he showed a tenacity of purpose, a sustained energy, a power of seeing facts, a judgment in picking counsellors which makes him seem like the real founder of that French monarchy which was to become the centre of the formation of the French state and the French nation. He does not appear to have had any far reaching plans, but he did with all his might what lay nearest to him and thus laid an indispensable foundation for the kingship that was to be. A chronicler says: "The father of Louis was inert both in war and justice and the nobles of the Isle de France were often in arms against him." The young king was "therefore compelled to crush the tyranny of freebooters and rebels."

Louis accepted the task and worked all his life to set the royal estates in order. So, though he neither made large conquests, nor passed memorable laws, he did a king's duty in a kingly way. He was the very picture of what was meant by the later phrase of a "king who can mount his horse." Towards the end of his life, when morbid corpulence increased, he was lifted into the saddle that he might still keep the field. In his prime he was a stout man of his hands, skilful with the sword. If a château was to be stormed he was the first through the gates or plunging through the water of the ditches to hew down the palisade; fulfilling, his friend and biographer Suger says, "the duty of a soldier rather than a king." But there was not much generalship on either side of the small skirmishes and sieges in the Isle de France. Both sides used a little craft, but, on the whole, everybody hoped to win by hard blows and reckless courage.

Rough fighter as he was, Louis VI had the eye of a

king and knew how to pick the servants of the crown. Two men of very lowly birth rose high in the royal service, one a simple priest of Paris, the other a monk of St. Denis: Garlande, who became seneschal and chancellor, and Suger, the king's adviser and biographer. He understood well the main royal task. "It is the duty of kings," he writes, "to repress with the high hand and by right of their office, the tyrants who tear apart the state by never ending wars, find all their pleasure in pillage, destroy churches and terribly oppress the poor." There were in the vicinity of Paris plenty of such nobles who became cruel bandits. The Count of Corbeil, Suger says, had "nothing left in him of a human being but was become a veritable brute, a true chief of scoundrels . . . who, when he was killed in battle, betook himself and his wars into the depths of hell where there is eternal fighting to keep up." King Louis knew what to do with such pests who burnt churches, killed priests, plundered and mutilated merchants who passed their castles and tortured peasants to collect money, or in wanton cruelty. "Consumed by thirst for vengeance, he strung upon the gallows as food for crows and vultures, all murderous scoundrels of this sort who fell into his hands."

He was the first ruler of France since Charlemagne whose conduct was steadily governed by the ideal of a public authority created to maintain public order, with duties towards all and rights over all. So he strove all his life against those lawless feudal barons on his family possessions who feared not God neither regarded man. The Peace and the Truce of God were not in the end very effective. Louis the Fighter demontsrated that there might be something much stronger; the Peace of the King.

When Louis came to die, he gave his royal ring to his son Louis VII and swore him "to protect the Church of God, orphans and the poor." When he felt death near,

he ordered a rug spread on the floor and a cross marked out on it with ashes. His servants lifted him and laid him on the cross, where he died in the fifty-ninth year of his age and the thirtieth of his reign.

One other idea besides that of the king as the maintainer of justice and peace, he may have gained from Suger, on whose pages it appears as a faint prophecy—the idea of a larger France, a centre of pride and devotion and not simply a congeries of local interests and ambitions. Louis' petty conflicts with brutal and rebellious nobles of the royal domain of his family were interrupted by a war more like a national war. The Emperor formed an army of Lorrainers, Germans, Bavarians, Suabians, and Saxons to attack Rheims. Louis summoned all his barons to the royal banner. The feudal levies came not only from the King's domains. The Count of Flanders, the Duke of Aquitaine, the Count of Brittany, and the Count of Angers rallied to the royal standard. These came, Suger says, "at the call of France." And he imagines the barons saying to one another while waiting the Imperial attack which never came: "Let us march bravely against our enemies, so that they cannot go home without punishment and cannot say that they have had the proud presumption to attack France, the mistress of the earth." Pride was one of the outstanding characteristics of feudal seigneurs, but pride in France was at that time a sentiment more apt to be in the mind of a literary monk who had become the King's chief counsellor, than in the mind of the Duke of Aquitaine or the Count of Flanders or of Brittany.

The forty odd great feudatories of the crown who acknowledged themselves vassals of the King but never expected to obey him, were, by the force of similar circumstances, led to go through, each on his own great fief or congeries of fiefs, a work like that of Louis VI on the royal domain. The prosperity of the duchy or county

depended on peace and to defend it a strong hand was needed. Therefore by the middle of the twelfth century, there were in France fewer private wars than there were a hundred years before and the old type of plundering baron was beginning to be less common.

Louis VII, when he acceded to the throne, had many favourable chances for a brilliant and successful reign. His father had not indeed increased the power of the crown over the great feudal dignitaries, several of whom exceeded the king in wealth and power. He had scarcely mingled seriously in their affairs. But he had reduced to order and subjection the domain, or family possession which the royal house of the Capetians held as their inheritance from the Dukes of the Franks and the Counts of Paris. Slight reactions toward the days when every seigneur did what was right in his own eyes, Louis VII speedily put down. For he had in him the making of a soldier. He shared his father's skill in arms and once, in Asia Minor, surprised by the Turks and cut off from his knights, he set his back against a rock and by sheer swordsmanship kept his enemies at bay until help came. In addition he started with a large potential increase of power by his marriage to the heiress of Aquitaine, a powerful feudal duchy of central France.

In spite of these advantages the reign of Louis VII set back the monarchy a hundred years for three reasons. Eight years after his accession, Louis, then only twenty-four years old, announced to his assembled court that he intended to lead a crusade to help the Christian states of the feudal Kingdom of Jerusalem. The Pope could not very well refuse to co-operate in such a royal undertaking, but he was very lukewarm about it, and the barons of the kingdom received the idea with a marked lack of enthusiasm. It is doubtful whether the King could have rallied a great army under the banner of the cross, if he had not been helped by one who was, not only the great-

est of his subjects, but the most outstanding personality in Christendom.

St. Bernard was the son of a noble of Burgundy who had died on the first crusade. As the lad lacked the physical vigor to become a knight, he was sent to study in preparation for an ecclesiastical career, but he entered a monastery of reformed Benedictines bringing with him about thirty of his relatives and friends from noble families of the neighbourhood. The reformed order spread and Bernard became Abbot of Clairvaux, a new monastery. His great austerities (his monks did not use meat at all and sometimes ate beech leaves instead of vegetables), his marvellous power as a preacher and the fame of the miracles of healing soon reported by the pilgrims who flocked to Clairvaux, made him, by the time he was thirty, the best known ecclesiastic of the realm, and his notable triumph in restoring the unity of the Church rent by schism made him for years more famous and perhaps more influential than any sovereign or pope.

This great churchman had gentler sentiments than most men of his time. When he heard of a mob killing heretics he regretted it, because "faith is to be produced by persuasion, not imposed by force." But this son of a crusader had no gentleness toward the infidel. "The knight who has taken the cross," he said, "kills with a good conscience and dies the more tranquilly: by killing he works for Christ and by dying he wins salvation." His powerful and fiery words roused all France to action. Crossing the Rhine he preached in Germany and the Emperor joined Louis VII in taking the cross.

But the French disliked the Germans and made fun of their heavy armour, their slow movements and their drunkenness. The Germans reciprocated the dislike and only agreed with the French in quarrelling with the Greeks of Constantinople. Bad generalship, jealousy, and lack of patience made the siege of Damascus a failure and the Christians retreated. So enormous was the

disaster that St. Bernard, who had prophesied success, was attacked and his influence declined. "The children of the Church," he wrote, "have perished in the desert, smitten by the sword and consumed by hunger. The spirit of division has spread itself among the princes. . . . We promised success and lo desolation. . . . I will endure willingly the tongues of evil speakers and the poisoned arrows of blasphemy, provided they are not directed at God. I am willing to be dishonoured provided His glory is not impugned."

During the two years of the King's absence, the Capetian monarchy had been ruled by one of the ablest counsellors ever found by a king of France. Suger was born of obscure parents and at an early age entered the monastery of St. Denis. He was sent to several schools and entered into the service of Louis the Fighter, who relied on his advice and made him Abbot of the enormously wealthy monastery of St. Denis. Louis VII made Suger his right hand man. The Abbot of St. Denis was not like the Abbot of Clairvaux, who banished from church and cloister all frescoes and carving, would not allow even gilded crosses and forbade all silken altar covers. The splendid stained glass of the time found no place in the windows of a Cistercian chapel and the monks chanted their prayers without an organ. For Bernard held that "works of art are idols which turn men from God or, at best, are fit only to excite the piety of feeble and worldly souls." But Suger collected for the shrine of St. Denis chalices, reliquaries set with precious stones, silken coverings, the work of the best jewellers and goldsmiths of his time. He rebuilt the church of St. Denis on a vast scale and in the new style. He was a scholar deeply read, not only like Bernard in the Scriptures and theology, but in Horace, Juvenal, and other classic authors and he produced, not sermons or writings on theology, but a treatise on state administration and a historical biography.

This cultivated, experienced, and patriotic monk ruled

with firmness and equity, kept the finances in order, and foiled a plot among some of the nobles and clergy to replace the King by his brother. His panegyrist says, with more truth than most panegyrics, "Those strangers who came from Italy and England to study his methods, called him the Solomon of his century and his own people called him the father of his country." With his death less than two years after the return of the King, the misfortunes of the reign began.

These two dissimilar great contemporary priests, St. Bernard and Suger, have been associated in legend. During the recent war one of our officers heard from the sacristan of a little church the following story: "In the days of the ancient kings the Abbot Suger and St. Bernard were warm friends. St. Bernard used to help Suger manage the King by sending up to Paris casks of the delicious wine which still comes from the vineyards the captain sees from the top of the tower where we stand. The devil disguised himself as an old beggar and, as a wagon load of casks passed by, broke one of the wheels by a blow from a huge stone. St. Bernard saw through the trick and, making the sign of the cross, changed the devil into the shape of a wheel and compelled him to turn round and round under the load of the King's wine all the long road to Paris. So Suger got his casks and kept favour with the King to the great gain of God's Holy Church."

During the crusade, Louis quarrelled with his wife and two years after their return an assembly of prelates, princes and barons, pronounced their marriage void on the ground of consanguinity. Whatever reasons the King may have had for doing this, it was a stupid political blunder. Eleanor did what any farseeing statesman would have feared she might do. She offered to marry Henry Plantagenet, Count of Anjou and Duke of Normandy. She was thirty and he was nineteen, but he promptly agreed to a marriage which added the great

Duchy of Aquitaine to his dominions. Two years later he inherited the throne of his grandfather, Henry I of England. French kings had often had English kings as vassals, but never one who was so powerful within the realm of France. Although Henry II subdued Ireland, destroyed the independence of the Welsh princes and forced the Scottish kings to acknowledge vassalship, his chief interest was continental. He wanted to shut up the French king within the limits of a diminished domain and make the whole eastern and southern part of the realm, with the British Isles, the seat of a great Franco-British kingdom under the dynasty of Plantagenet. The growing power of the Capetian monarchy would be paralyzed, if necessary destroyed—between the pressure of his ally, the German Empire, and this mighty Plantagenet kingdom.

The third cause of the failure of the forty-three years' reign of Louis VII was the progressive decay of his character, which made him incapable of meeting so great a danger. Instead of vigorous action he showed, again and again, irresolution, procrastination, shrinking from responsibility, and an "incredible softness." He got much help from the conspiracy of his former wife and her sons by her new husband, who were tempted to rebellion by their own stupid ambition and the intolerable harshness of their father. Louis was aided also by the quarrel of his adversary with the Church, which led to the murder of the Archbishop of Canterbury. But nevertheless Louis was driven to the wall and compelled to sign humiliating treaties. At his death the Capetian monarchy had lost all the gains of a century, and his great vassal, Henry II, of the house of Plantagenet, master of the British Isles and more than half of modern France, was the most powerful sovereign in the world.

Yet the disastrous reign was not all loss. The drift of the times away from the excessive divisions of govern-

mental powers of undeveloped feudalism helped Louis VII, and two traits of his character aided the drift of the times in strengthening the moral authority of the crown, even while its physical force grew less.

The King, though humiliated and shut in by his enemies, was still the King anointed of God to do justice, and a mass of letters in the royal archives show that from all parts of the realm, appeal was made to him for justice. The clergy led the way, as for example, the poor bishop from the wilds of the Cevennes mountains, where the King had no power, who made the long and dangerous journey to Paris to take an oath of fidelity to prove that his bishopric "belonged to the Kingdom of France." The small nobility followed; as, for instance, that country gentleman who came from his little castle near the shore of the Mediterranean to Paris to have the dispute between him and his viscountess judged by the King's court. The burghers also turned to the throne, like those citizens of Toulouse, chief city of the county more independent of the king than any other great fief of the realm, who wrote, "After God we turn to you as our good master, our defender, our liberator." The most royal trait in Louis was his love of justice and so far as he could help these appeals he did it without fear or favour.

Another royal trait in him was a genuine sympathy for the poor and the oppressed and this fitted him to forward a movement of emancipation begun in the eleventh century, which, during the twelfth century, greatly improved the condition of many of the common people in the country and in the towns. Its simplest form was in the emancipation of serfs by charters of manumission. This was done not only out of humanity, or in obedience to the teaching of the Church. It was done also because intelligent lords saw that free labour was more productive than forced labour, or because the increasing wealth of those who lived by agriculture enabled them to buy free-

dom. Louis VII helped this process and saw the ideal side of it, for, in a chart of manumission he wrote of "the natural liberty given by God to all men."

It was, however, in forwarding the movement for the emancipation of the burghers, or dwellers in cities, that Louis VII was most active. At the beginning of the eleventh century, the largest and richest French cities were not their own masters. They had many masters, lay and ecclesiastic, who had inherited feudal rights over them, which were mingled in inextricable confusion. The process by which these urban authorities were suppressed, or their relations to each other and the city simplified, is too complicated and varied to be traced in short space. By armed revolt and bloody riot, by money, by co-operation with intelligent lords who saw that the increased prosperity of the city would be profitable to them, the burghers in many parts obtained more or less liberty before the end of the first half of the twelfth century. Some of the rich manufacturing and commercial cities, like those of Flanders and northern France, or seaports like Bordeaux, Bayonne and Marseilles, became free communes, self-governing political units owing homage to their feudal seigneur but electing their own magistrates, managing their own affairs and able to defend their walls by a more or less trained militia. On the other hand, in certain regions the cities did not obtain any charters of privilege at all.

Louis VII was apparently the first king to see the advantage for the crown in this movement toward chartered towns and communal liberties creating a third estate, a balance to the power of the clergy and the feudal nobility —a new class in society, the burghers, who, if fostered by the crown, would look to the king for justice and naturally stand by him in the conflict with the feudal nobles.

CHAPTER XI

PHILIP AUGUSTUS AND WHY HE DESERVED HIS NAME. THE SOUTHERN HERETICS

Philip II, the son of Louis VII, became king in 1180 at the age of fifteen and he reigned for forty-three years. At his death he had increased the royal domain three-fold, and he was the first French king who had more money and more subjects living on lands belonging to him than any of his vassals. Such a huge gain in power led his contemporaries to give him the title of Augustus borne by the Roman emperors. It was won only by a desperate intermittent struggle in which the skill, the craft, the shrewd common sense, the unscrupulous tenacity of Philip were the determining factors.

Scarcely was the boy king on the throne, when a league of great feudatories of the north formed by his own mother and his uncles, tried to keep him in tutelage. In the struggle, which lasted intermittently for five years, there was less fighting than plundering and burning. Philip held his own in this wretched parody on war made by a professional fighting class, and, at the age of twenty, was victor over his own relatives and their friends among the feudal nobility.

The most powerful of the vassals of the crown, whose domains covered more than half the realm, maintained during this struggle an attitude of benevolent neutrality. Perhaps Henry II of England, of the House of Plantagenet, felt that he was too strong to fear anything from the son of the King he had beaten and humiliated. But the young French King did not hesitate to attack his dangerous vassal. He formed a league with the restless and ambitious sons of Henry II. Richard repudiated his father

at a public conference and kneeled at the feet of the French King declaring himself Philip's man. Deserted by his children and smitten with mortal illness, the King of England was forced to give his adversary a war indemnity and to agree to do homage for all his continental fiefs. Two days later he died, cursing his sons and murmuring: "Shame, shame on a conquered king."

The struggle was resumed under his sons. The eldest, Richard, forced Philip Augustus to a truce in which the French King surrendered all he had gained in ten years of war. But Richard's brother and successor, John, was so badly beaten in the fourth stage of this long fight, that the bulk of the French lands of the Plantagenets became the domain of the Capets. Philip Augustus even collected a fleet and army at Boulogne with the purpose of invading England and putting his son on the throne.

The long dynastic conflict between the French kings and their royal vassals now entered on its fifth stage. John of England became the centre of a formidable league against Philip Augustus and a great army consisting mainly of vassals of John's nephew, the Emperor of Germany, mobilized in Flanders to invade France from the north, while an English army made a diversion from the south.

Philip met the northern army of the confederates at Bouvines in the greatest pitched battle for generations before or after. Probably about forty thousand foot and sixty-five hundred mounted men followed the four-horse car which bore the dragon standard of the Empire surmounted by a golden eagle. From twenty-five to thirty thousand infantry and about seven thousand cavalry followed the blue flag embroidered with gold lilies of the house of Capet. In the centre the militia of the French communes was broken and driven back by the more numerous and better trained infantry of the great Flemish cities. But the victors' advance was halted by the charge

of the French cavalry. In the desperate melée, as the knights cut their way through the dense masses of men, Philip was separated from his bodyguard and dragged from his horse by a soldier of Bruges who caught the peak of a halberd in the chain-mail about the King's throat. He was nearly killed, but got to his feet with great agility and hewed about him manfully with his sword until his knights remounted him to continue the charge which swept the Flemings from the field.

Behind them were the Imperial squadrons, which closed with the triumphing French. The Emperor's horse was killed and fell with him. French knights rushed up to capture him, but the Saxons blocked the way. Otto was mounted and, probably because he was dazed by his fall and the blows he had received, rode off the field. Dismayed by his flight, his knights began to yield ground and, as cavalry from the victorious French wings closed in on their flanks and rear, they gave up the struggle. The slaughter among the infantry on both sides in this three hours' battle was great, but, as usual in feudal conflicts, not many knights were killed, only a hundred and seventy on the Emperor's side and a much smaller number of Philip's men. Five counts and a hundred and thirty-one knights were taken prisoners by the French.

So ended, in sweeping victory, the great struggle of Philip's life. For the last nine years of his reign he was never obliged to take the field in person again. Able, bold, patient, unscrupulous, adaptable but inflexible, Philip Augustus had destroyed the empire of his rival and replaced the adversary of his boyhood as the most powerful monarch of Christendom.

The enormous increase of the power of the crown during the reign of Philip Augustus was not gained by politics and arms only. The growth of the moral influence of the ideal of the kingship as the highest source of justice, which had continued even under the weak and hu-

miliated Louis VII, continued under his strong and triumphant successor. The power of the king also spread. For the royal provosts increased during Philip's reign from thirty-eight to ninety-four and they were active in extending the royal control. It began to be the practice to seek the consent of the king for important marriages and, from far off fiefs, family and private agreements began to be sent to Paris for his confirmation. On the contrary the barons commenced to sign new royal laws; a proof that they acknowledged the right of the king to change feudal law.

For this increased power Philip sought to find support elsewhere than in castles and soldiers. He had quarrels with the Papacy because of his treatment of one of his wives unjustly divorced, but he emphasized the traditional friendliness of his house toward the clergy of the realm. He protected them but he would not allow the ecclesiastical courts to interfere with the king's courts, and he limited the right of asylum in monasteries. Although a protector of the Church, he would not permit her to become in France a foreign corporation independent of the law and the king.

Philip Augustus sought also for the crown the support of the people. He was a hard man and he had not much sympathy for the miseries of the serfs; perhaps because he felt they could not help the crown. It was among the burghers, citizens of the free cities, that he found new supporters for the throne; natural allies against the feudal aristocracy. He showed himself plainly their protector and leader. No king of France made so many communes as he did and he is called by the ablest modern historians of his reign the "creator of communes."

Many of his predecessors had used the counsel and the work of men of burgher blood, but they did it sporadically. Philip made the burghers of the free cities associates in government. On the royal domain he ordered

the provosts, when the affairs of a city were to be considered, to deliberate and act with the help of four burghers. When he went on crusade he left the royal seal and the keys of the chests of the royal treasure in the hands of six burghers representing "all the people of Paris." This friendship with the burghers naturally led him to favour commerce. He became a patron of merchants' associations. He urged foreign merchants to come to France and pledged his honor for their protection. Even in time of war, in spite of the danger of spies, he allowed the inhabitants of hostile territory free access to the great French fairs of Champagne, Troyes, Lagny, Provins, and Bar-sur-Aube, where, midway on the natural route from Bruges to Venice, the trade of the Baltic and the eastern Mediterranean met.

In patronizing cities and the merchant class, he was taking advantage of a great general social movement of the times. For it was in the twelfth century that western Europe was gradually but definitely transformed. Economic development and the formation of a burgher class began to set her free from the bondage of a method of social organization based solely on men's relation to land. Commerce and industry which built the cities took their place alongside of agriculture and changed it. The products of the soil were no longer consumed where they were produced. Grain and eggs became objects of barter in the nearby city. Wood became a raw material for foreign manufactures and both export and manufacture made plain the power of liquid capital, while the perception of its need brought banking into use in spite of the hostility of the Church to all lending of money at interest. In short, "possibly no period in all history had a more profound effect upon humanity." (Pirenne.)

Philip Augustus was the first great administrator of his family. He first gave the crown regular *bureaux* of agents filled with king's servants, priests, burghers, small

nobles, who owed their positions to talents and training and not to birth. His justice was administered largely by lawyers. For intimate counsellors he frequently took educated monks and for eighteen years the chairman of the royal council was his mother's brother, the Archbishop of Rheims.

To the provosts of his predecessors, fiscal agents, police judges, collectors in their provostries of the king's domain, he added a new set of agents, the *baillis,* or royal superintendents. These did not, as the provosts did, pay themselves out of what they collected. The *baillis* were salaried by the king and they were not always assigned to the same locality. They must hold regular courts in their districts and, three times a year, go to Paris to hand in their accounts. On the whole, this new institution made the administration more efficient and more just, but it needed the eye of the master; as is shown by the following anecdote which also gives a specimen of the famous shrewd wit of the king.

A bailiff urged a knight, his neighbour, to sell him a certain piece of land, but the knight steadily refused. When the knight died, his widow also refused to sell the property. So the bailiff, with two confederates hired in the market place, went to the cemetery at night, dug up the body and stood it on its feet. Then he demanded before the two witnesses that he sell the land. "He who keeps silence consents," called out one of them. They put the money in the hand of the corpse and reburied it. The next morning the bailiff sent his workmen to work on the land, and, when the widow protested, he said her husband had sold it to him. The case was appealed to the King and the bailiff produced his two witnesses, who swore they had been present at the sale. The King took one of them into a corner apart and asked, "Do you know your pater noster? (Lord's prayer)." The man said "Yes." "Then recite it," said the King, and the man re-

peated it in the usual chant under the breath. Meanwhile the King called out from time to time loud enough to be heard by those left in the gallery, "Ah, that's the way it was" and "Oh now you're telling me the truth." When the prayer was ended, the King said, "Well, you haven't lied to me. You can count on a pardon," and ordered him shut up in another room. Then going to the second witness he said, "Look here now. Don't lie any more. Your friend has told me all that happened as plainly as if he were reciting the Lord's prayer." The wretch thought all was discovered and confessed. The bailiff threw himself at the feet of the King, who condemned him to perpetual banishment and gave his property to the poor widow.

Philip saw clearly that the crown could not maintain its power without money. He diminished peculation and developed non-productive taxes. He commuted feudal service for money payments and he taxed the Jews. By such means the royal income of his father's time was nearly doubled during his reign and the royal money began to replace, in many parts of the realm, the money coined by the great feudatories.

A large part of this increase he spent on his army, which, except in great crises, was made up of paid soldiers. There were the king's chevaliers, fully armed cavalry, usually men of noble birth, who might be paid in fiefs granted for life. Then there were the sergeants of the king, usually burghers. Then there were archers and crossbow men and a corps of engineers who cared for the siege machines. He spent much money also building or extending the walls of the cities of his realm.

Largely by his own efficiency in using the drift of the times, he became the first sovereign who can be called in the modern sense, King of France.

Philip Augustus was succeeded by his son, Louis VIII, during whose brief reign (1223–1226) an action begun

fourteen years before his death brought under the immediate rule of the crown great independent feudatories the decrease of whose power neither Louis VI nor Louis VII had dared to attempt. With the beginning of this action, the crown had nothing to do. The Papacy and the feudal baronage were the authors of what is known as the Albigensian crusade launched in 1209.

In the lands drained by the Garonne and the lower part of the Rhone heresy had, from the middle of the twelfth century, firmly established itself in the form of an eastern Manichæism with no more intimate relation to Christianity than Mahometanism. These *Catharists,* as they were called, included many seigneurs and were protected or at least tolerated, by several great lords. Pope Innocent III (1198–1216) tried at first to convert them by missionaries. When this brought no results, he tried three times to persuade Philip Augustus to suppress them by force. The King said he could not fight both the King of England and the Albigenses. Soon after a papal legate was killed by one of the squires of the Count of Toulouse whom he had excommunicated. This unheard of sacrilege drew upon the south of France the threatened crusade. An army of fifty thousand men assembled at Lyons and swept down the Rhone under the command of a papal legate. For ten years the crusaders fought to exterminate the heretics and dispossess the great nobles who had tolerated them. They began their campaign by massacring seven thousand men, women, and children at the storming of Béziers, and ended it by the cold-blooded murder of five thousand when Marmande surrendered. In between they hung or burnt catharist nobles in batches of fifty at a time. But they marched to battle with the chant "Come, Holy Spirit, Come," and the Church gave the same blessing to the merciless shedding of the blood of heretics that she gave to the massacres of the infidels in the East. Heresy was wiped out and the whole splendid

but soft and luxurious southern civilization went with it. When the bloody work was over the troubadours sang no more.

The results of all this slaughter were for the profit of the crown of France. Louis VIII had twice marched as a crusader, and as king he led an army to Languedoc, which met little resistance. The great feudal states, which, at his father's accession, had been independent in everything but name, submitted to the crown. On his way back to Paris he died (1226) of dysentery after a reign of three years. A few months before his death he issued a royal law which made heresy everywhere in France a crime to be punished by the stake and at about the same time similar laws were promulgated by the Emperor of Germany.

CHAPTER XII

THE SOUL OF FRANCE FINDS EXPRESSION. GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE. THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

The growth of the spirit of France during this period from 1108 to 1226, when her material form expanded and took definite shape, found its most remarkable and influential expression in church-building.

The style of architecture born in northern France in the twelfth century which dominated the building of churches in Europe until the sixteenth century, is, for want of a better name, called gothic. There are three chief elements in this style, here mentioned in the order of their importance.

1. The systematic use of the ribbed cross vault.

2. The use of flying buttresses to brace the chief walls against the thrust of the roof vault threatening to push them over outwards.

3. (and least determinative) Systematic use of the pointed arch instead of the round arch.

The twelfth century saw in northern France a rapid development of technical architectural skill which became the instrument of a revival of religious fervour not equalled in any other epoch. Before the middle of the century people were everywhere clamouring for more, larger and better built churches. In many places pious folk of all social ranks who were unable to give money, helped to drag to the new churches stone, wood and food for the workmen. In the last half of the twelfth century the gothic was firmly rooted in the northern half of France and the conditions were ready for the creation in the early thirteenth century of those miracles of human skill and sense of beauty, the cathedrals of Amiens, Char-

tres, Paris, and Rheims. This movement was suspended, or at least rendered all but stagnant, by the horrors of the Hundred Years War (1328–1453); when men were too busy battering down castles to think much about building churches.

After the intervention of the peasant girl, herself a product of religious feeling, had turned the balance in favour of the native royal race, the art of building churches displayed, in the last half of the fifteenth and the first years of the sixteenth century, all over France, renewed activity; not supported by popular feeling like the church building of the twelfth and thirteenth century, but creating, nevertheless, a great number of churches large and small.

During the whole history, stretching over four centuries, this art of building churches in the gothic style never, in France or elsewhere, reached a fixed form until it ceased to be practised and was replaced by a method of building churches which threw away its three determining elements, ribbed cross vaulting, flying buttresses, and pointed windows, to adopt a style derived through Italy from classic models; whose salient features to the ordinary eye are classic columns, rectangular windows and the Roman round arch.

For the development of this gothic manner of church building, four stages have been suggested by the great historian of gothic art from whom the material for this brief account of it is taken. (Lasteyrie.)

1. The *transition* style, when characteristic features of the gothic and romanesque styles are mingled in the same building. This was fully developed at the accession of Philip Augustus.

2. The *lanceolate* gothic which had reached its height a century later at the death of St. Louis.

3. The *rayonnant* gothic, the vogue of which showed its faint beginnings in the middle of the thirteenth century and persisted through the fourteenth.

4. The *flamboyant* gothic which gained all Europe during the fifteenth century and, during half the sixteenth century, opposed vigorous resistance to the spread of the architecture of the Renascence which succeeded it.

The last three epithets applied to the varying styles of the developing gothic arc derived from the most obvious thing about any building—the shape of its windows. In the second the mullions which make the frame of the window are close together, giving to the lights a long narrow shape suggesting a lance head. In the third, the need of holding the panes in very large windows which, without support, would be driven in by any strong gust, led to long perpendicular mullions bound together by a complicated round top, whose parts spread out from a common centre like rays of light. The mullions of the last developed form of gothic suggest the undulations of flame.

During the long development of gothic architecture, the ordinary workmen engaged in church building acquired a diffused skill perhaps never equaled by any set of handicraftsmen in the history of human attempts to express the sense of beauty. The architects, confiding in the skill of their workmen, developed a boldness of beautiful conception not surpassed in another sphere by even the boldest feats of modern engineering. The gothic churches show "a lightness impossible to surpass," as the architect progressively replaced by glass all parts of the walls not absolutely necessary to the stability of the building. "Nobody had ever dreamed of raising vaults as high as they did, and, in addition, they so far cut down the mass of masonry that the cathedral became nothing but a cage of glass held up by a slender skeleton of stone, which would soon have fallen in ruins because of the thrust of the arches, if it had not been for skilful and learned combinations of light and graceful flying buttresses."

The opportunity to decorate these vast windows called into being the marvellous beauty of French stained glass. This art had reached a high degree of perfection by the

beginning of the thirteenth century and from that time on it made an extraordinary development. Much of the fragile product of these artists has perished, but there is still a good deal of it which forms part of the treasure of the world. The cathedral of Chartres has one hundred and forty-six windows treating 1359 subjects which were made in the second quarter of the thirteenth century.

It was Cardinal Newman who wrote: "The gothic style is as harmonious and as intellectual as it is graceful. . . . It is endowed with a profound and commanding beauty, such as no other style possesses with which we are acquainted, and which probably the Church will not see surpassed till it attains to the Celestial City."

The four hundred years which followed the destruction of the Roman Empire of the West by the tribes of northern Europe were times of deepening intellectual darkness That any remains of the learning and literature of brighter days survived was due to the clergy and more especially to the monks, for they were the only people who even wanted to understand it. When therefore Charlemagne tried to restore Roman civilization in western Europe, he decreed that every monastery and cathedral should have a school. His Empire sank, during the latter half of the ninth and most of the tenth century, into darkness as deep as that from which he had rescued it. But, about the eleventh century, there began in France a revival of human effort in all directions which led in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries to a renascence, a mysterious stirring of the spirits of many men, which produced glorious forms of beauty in literature and the plastic arts, and a great refinement of thought and a desire for learning which, before the middle of the twelfth century, made Paris "as decidedly the centre of European thought and culture as Athens in the days of Pericles, or Florence in the days of Lorenzo dei Medici." (Rashdall.)

This renascence, so far as it showed in the love of the

literature of the past or the love of learning, began in those monastic or cathedral schools which had never wholly disappeared since the great educational scheme of Charlemagne. Two distinct tendencies developed. The first, represented by the cathedral school revived at Chartres in the beginning of the eleventh century, insisted that no man was educated who was ignorant of the best specimens of the literary art inherited from Rome. The other was afraid of classic literature because it was pagan. This shrinking is well typified by the dream of a student of the early eleventh century in which he saw Horace, Virgil and Juvenal under the form of three demons tempting him toward heresy and hell. The schools of this anti-classic type were the most numerous and were generally in monasteries. It must be noted that the monks, in spite of their fear of pagan writings, did one inestimable service to the books of the past: they gave them shelter in their libraries and copied them in the scriptoria for the reproduction of manuscripts which, in the larger monasteries, might hold as many as twelve copyists working at once. We have lost much of Latin literature: if it had not been for the Benedictine monks it would probably all be gone. "Other literatures have perished but (Sandys quoting Wordsworth)

> " 'Classic lore glides on,
> By these religious saved for all posterity.' "

The branch of learning which most of the reviving French schools of the eleventh and twelfth centuries emphasized was logic. Logic was safe: the formal principles of the art of reasoning are the same both for pagan and Christian. But logic as an intellectual exercise must have a subject on which it can be employed and the reviving mind, after the tenth century in France, found that subject in the reality of universals; an entirely abstract topic in which the dialectician who wished to show

his skill was apparently at a safe distance from the fixed orthodox doctrines of the Church.

The question was whether general names of sorts of things had any existence apart from the individual in which they were perceived. Or were they mere words coined by the mind? Did blackness exist apart from any black object? Was there any such thing as humanity except in a man? The extreme realists held that blackness and humanity actually existed. The extreme nominalists that they were nothing but sounds of the voice. These two positions seemed to scholastics to mark the possible limits of theories of the universe from pantheism, or the inclusion of all things under one great universal which alone really exists, to materialistic individualism, which denies all unity to a universe whose parts merely exist simultaneously without relation to each other or to the whole. The first assumption was called by the scholastics realism (universalia ante rem); the second nominalism (universalia post rem) and the controversy, as old as the Greek philosophers, came in the twelfth century to dominate the European learned world.

The reason was that this abstract logical controversy led to conclusions affecting the doctrines of the Church. If the real thing in any man was the humanity he shared with all other men, what becomes of the immortality of the soul? On the other hand on the assumption of the nominalist that only the individual is real, the doctrine of the Trinity is logically resolvable into unitarianism or tritheism.

When, by this rather roundabout way, logic reached theology and began to discuss it, the same suspicion of logic arose in the minds of orthodox mystics like St. Bernard, which had made their predecessors afraid of classic literature. They wished to receive belief entirely on authority and to vivify it by intense personal feeling. "To accept the doctrines of the Church because they were

rational was hardly less offensive to them than to reject them as irrational."

Just at this crisis in the development of the scholastic method of thought, there appeared in the Cathedral School of Paris a young man about twenty years old by the name of Abelard: a Breton noble who had given up the profession of arms and the inheritance of his father's fiefs to devote himself to learning. He soon acquired such skill in dialectical disputation that he decisively defeated his famous teacher, and became, at an early age, a famous master in the school of Paris (1115).

Just as the fame of Richard, King of England, the *preux chevalier*, managing sword and lance with unmatched skill, spread until his name became a terror to children in far off villages of Asia, so the skill of Abelard in verbal fence became famous throughout the whole learned world of western Europe. In addition he developed, by his study of classic literature, a style which, added to his extraordinary charm of voice and manner, made him the best lecturer in any school of Europe; and the cost of books copied by hand gave to the lecture capital importance in teaching. His fame therefore drew great numbers of students from all parts of Europe.

The movement was then well under way, which in the early part of the thirteenth century, organized out of municipal or cathedral schools three great universities at Salerno, at Bologna and at Paris; distinguished respectively for medicine, for law and for theology and arts. It was Abelard who made possible the long dominance over all other institutions of learning of the University organized at Paris two generations after his death. He not only gave to Parisian schools the fame which brought large crowds of students, but he left her the method and the spirit which made her the centre of European thought for generations.

He is ranked as the greatest intellect of the middle ages,

but he was an intellect without a character. His own account of his cold-blooded seduction of Heloise is one of the most repulsive pieces of the many repulsive pieces of self-portraiture which the perennial egotism of man has left to posterity. He produced nothing positive, but, in the development of the European civilization we have inherited, he was one of the earliest and most powerful champions of the rights of reason: though in comparison with many of the great heretics of later years who went to death for their beliefs, he appears at times a rather weak one. He thought "that doubt leads along the road of inquiry to truth" and was the first great leader in that attempt to support faith by reason, which, in the century after his death, produced Thomas Aquinas, the accepted champion of the Church.

But the heresy of one age is often the orthodoxy of the next. The great St. Bernard most bitterly denounced Abelard, who was twice tried for heresy. The first time he was obliged to burn his book on the Trinity with his own hands, which he did, as he tells us, "with groans and tears." The second time he was sentenced, and the Pope confirmed it, to indefinite imprisonment in a monastery.

The *Universitas,* the guild or corporation of teachers in the Cathedral School of Paris which had the right of licensing masters or teachers, was chartered by Philip Augustus. The reason was a town and gown row in which several students were killed. The charter granted all students who might be arrested the right of being handed over to the ecclesiastical courts. Other steps in the development of the guild were taken in the early thirteenth century and the new universitas or guild of teachers at Paris "became the model for the great majority of the universities of central Europe, including Oxford and Cambridge" (Mullinger). In 1210 a bull of Pope Innocent III began the long patronage of Paris by the Holy See, which made its theological faculty a sort of touch-

stone of orthodoxy throughout the world. The growth of the university was helped by that indefinable charm of Paris over cultivated minds first recorded by the Emperor Julian and confessed by a number of students of the twelfth century. John of Salisbury, secretary to three archbishops of Canterbury, wrote of "France the most civilized and mellowed of all nations." Another more materially minded student calls Paris "a place of delights, a garden of early fruits, where bread and wine abound" and another calls it "a queenly city which not only holds those who visit it, but draws the most distant to herself by the mellifluous delight of her natural gifts."

The origin and impulse for the system of scholastic theology of which Abelard has been called the intellectual progenitor was French, and its first and chief centre was the University of Paris. That institution, however, soon after its formation, became, like the scholastic theology itself, extremely cosmopolitan. Practically all the greatest scholastics during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries received part of their training at Paris and taught there at least for a while; but very few of them were Frenchmen by birth. This was inevitable under the conditions. The only way for a university to remain entirely national was to remain inconspicuous. Students and professors from any land went freely to universities, whether in Italy, southern France or England, because just as the Church everywhere prayed and praised in Latin, the universities everywhere taught in Latin, and all men of learning wrote to each other and for the public in Latin.

CHAPTER XIII

FRENCH POETRY. THE SONG OF ROLAND. THE TROUBADOURS. THE ROMANCES. NICOLETTE. INFLUENCE OF FRENCH THOUGHT AND SKILL

But alongside of the vast literature written in this language of an international class, toward which France was perhaps the largest contributor, there began to appear in the realm of the Capetian kings during the renascence of the twelfth century, a literature composed in the language spoken, not before the altar or in the school room, but by all men in the home and the street. This rapidly developed astonishing variety and beauty and became a stimulus and one of the models for the somewhat later and more slowly developed vernacular literature of other countries of western Europe.

When the civilization of the Mediterranean began to spread over semi-barbarous Gaul, the Roman Empire had two sorts of language; one written and spoken by the more cultivated Romans, another colloquial and used by the common people. The first was imperishably recorded for the delight of all future generations in the works of the writers of the Augustan age; the other has perished and we can only conjecture what it was like. The written Latin continued to be used for thirteen hundred years after the barbaric invasions of the fifth century and passed through periods of degradation and restoration. But, whether well or ill written, it remained, at any one period, everywhere the same language. On the contrary, the spoken language of the Roman Empire began very early to vary into many regional dialects and finally produced nine languages: Roumanian, Dalmatian, Sardinian, Italian, Rhætian (spoken in Switzerland), French, Provençal,

Spanish and Portuguese. The disintegrating influence of feudalism, which, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, threatened to divide the realm into a great number of jealous and hostile feudal states, showed in the appearance of a number of local dialects, many of which still persist in the form of accent. Some in more strikingly differentiated forms known as *patois* are not understandable to dwellers in other parts of France.

These dialects came, during the twelfth century, to be grouped into two masses called the *langue d'oc* or provençal of the south and the *langue d'oil* of the north. Two literary languages each understood by numbers of groups of people whose colloquial language was not identical, came into being and existed side by side until the literature of the *langue d'oc* perished in the thirteenth century amid the horrors of the Albigensian crusade. Then the *langue d'oil* of the north became the literary language of the whole realm of the Capetian kings and the base from which modern French has developed.

In the eleventh century everybody who wished to write or to read, understood Latin more or less. But it is evident that, by the time of Charles the Fighter, there was a considerable public who wished to read and could not read Latin easily. A long series of translations from the Latin began to appear. The vernacular did not in any sense replace the Latin for those who used the pen. But Latin became an instrument of thought. If a Latinist wanted poetry he still turned back to Virgil and Horace. If he made verses himself he chose his theme like the votary of the Muses who wrote toward the end of the reign of Philip Augustus, a Latin grammar in verse, which was a favourite textbook for three hundred years.

To express humour, imagination, love of natural beauty, social ideals or the reaction to the pleasures of daily life in this world, there was produced a mass of literature in a language known as Old French. This artistic prod-

uct of the forming spirit of France showed its greatest vigour during the reign of Louis VII and his son Philip Augustus (1137 to 1223). Its first patrons were the feudal nobles, though it soon produced forms of literature manifestly intended to give pleasure to the new class of burghers, rapidly rising during that period to wealth and influence. This literature, whether epic, lyric, didactic or satiric, was all but entirely in verse, and, at first, was neither written nor read, but sung; later recited or read aloud.

Much of this literature is therefore not the work of individual poets. We are ignorant of the lives of the writers; in many instances even the name of the author is unknown. This poetry did not express personalities. It is rather the work of a class of poets and minstrels. "For the Middle Ages restricted in every way the development of the individual and therefore of the artist." The very impersonality of this literature makes it the more trustworthy record of the ideals and character of those who loved it.

The dominant form of this vernacular literature, which was in its full vigour from the middle of the twelfth century to the end of the first quarter of the thirteenth century, is the *chanson de geste,* or heroic epic. The earliest and best specimen of it is the Song of Roland. The form in which we have this poem was written down during the first part of the twelfth century in the language of the west of France. "It deserves to be and to remain always for France a truly national work, the dominant work of the French Middle Ages." (G. Paris.) It contains thirty-three thousand words and the writer will essay in two thousand words, mainly the nearest equivalents of its own, to display, not its native beauty, but the leading ideas and feelings of those who took delight in it.

"King Charles, our Emperor, the Great, spent seven full years in Spain and conquered it to the sea except

Saragossa. The King Marsile holds it who loves not God. He serves Mahomet and prays to Apollo. King Marsile is at Saragossa. He calls his dukes and counts and demands counsel for he has no army to give battle. His best councilor advises to speak Charles fair, to give him bears and lions and dogs, seven hundred camels and a thousand falcons, with four hundred mules loaded with gold and silver and to promise to come to Aix at the feast of St. Michael to receive the law of the Christians and become his vassal. The Emperor asks counsel of his barons. Roland advises war. Ganelon advises to accept Marsile's surrender. He is supported by the Duke of Nismes and they say, 'The Duke has spoken well.' "

Charles then asks who will go as messenger? The Duke of Nismes, Roland, Archbishop Turpin, offer, but are told they cannot be spared. Then Roland names Ganelon "my stepfather." Ganelon is filled with fury and says, "If God grants that I come back I will do you a damage which will last as long as you live." Roland laughs and Ganelon "was so grieved that he almost burst with wrath." Charles sends word that the Saracen King must become a Christian and he will be given half of Spain as a fief. If not, he would be taken to Aix to die a vile and shameful death. Marsile asks Ganelon when will Charles, who to his knowledge is more than two hundred years old, be tired of war and conquest? Ganelon says never while his nephew Roland lives. So Ganelon and Marsile form a plot. Marsile is to accept Charles' offer and, when Charles goes over the mountains, to attack his rear-guard and kill Roland. They swear it: the King on the book of the law of Mahomet, the Christian on the sacred relics in the pommel of his sword.

So the Emperor Charles starts over the mountains and when he asks who shall command the rear-guard, Ganelon names Roland, who is furious and calls Ganelon "a wicked man of vile stock." Roland will not keep more than

twenty thousand Frenchmen and his eleven comrades, the bravest in France. "High are the mountains and gloomy, misty the valleys, and the defiles sinister. That day even the French pass them with great trouble. The noise of their march is heard at fifteen leagues. When they saw Gascony, domain of their Lord, they think of their fiefs and lands, of their daughters at home and their noble wives. There is not one who does not weep with tenderness. Above all the others Charles is filled with anguish. He has left his nephew at the gates of Spain. Pity seizes him, he weeps, for he cannot restrain himself, and one hundred thousand Frenchmen are filled with sinister fear for Roland." Back at the gates of Spain, Oliver, Roland's friend, sees a huge army of pagans approaching. He curses the traitor Ganelon and begs Roland to sound his ivory horn and call back the army. But Roland answers, "That would be to act like a fool. In sweet France I should lose by it my renown." "For his seigneur one ought to suffer great evils and endure great heat and cold and lose flesh and blood."

Archbishop Turpin preaches to the army: "Lords, barons, Charles has left us here: for our King we ought to die. Help to uphold Christendom. Beg mercy of God. I will absolve you for the salvation of your souls. If you die you will be holy martyrs and you will have your places in the highest paradise." A Saracen named Abisme rides at the head of Marsile's army. "There is no greater felon in the troop. He is full of vices and of great crimes. He does not believe in God, but he is valiant and bold to rashness." The archbishop says to himself as soon as he sees him: "This Saracen seems to me a great heretic. It is best for me to kill him." The archbishop is on a horse he took from a king he killed in Denmark. He rides at the pagan, cuts through his shield, sparkling with amethysts, topaz and carbuncles and pierces him from side to side. The pagan falls dead on the ground and the French

cry: "In the hands of the Archbishop the Cross will never be disgraced."

The battle goes on in a series of single combats, and the pagan leaders are minutely described. They range from the Admiral Balaguez with a very beautiful body and a face bold and clear, who "would be a true baron if he were a Christian," to "the brood of the big-nosed, broad-eared, Ethiopians, blacker than ink with nothing white about them except their teeth."

Roland and his friends kill pagans with blows that split the helm, cut the chain mail, cleave the body, cut through the saddle and pierce deep into the horse's spine, so that horse and man are killed by the same blow. But the number of enemies is too great. The Christian chiefs fall one by one and Roland says: "I will sound my horn and Charles will hear it and come back." Oliver said, "that would be for all your relatives a great dishonour and opprobrium and that shame would be on them all their life. When I begged you to do it you did not. If you do it now it is against my advice. To sound your horn would not be the deed of a brave man. But how bloody both your arms are." Roland answered, "I have struck beautiful blows." The two friends are about to quarrel, but the archbishop stops them. He bids sound the horn, for though it is too late the King will avenge them and bury them in churches. "We shall not be eaten by wolves, swine and dogs."

Oliver falls and Roland says over him his farewell: "Sire, my comrade, alas for your bravery. We were together for days and years. You never did me wrong and I never did you wrong. To see you dead makes it sorrow for me to live." With these words Roland faints on his horse. His stirrups of fine gold hold him straight in the saddle, so that even though he leans one side he cannot fall. The last of the paladins to die is Turpin of Rheims. His horse is pierced by four lances but the valiant arch-

bishop fights on foot with his sword of brown steel called Almace. He falls, the centre of four hundred Saracens wounded, pierced through from side to side or with their heads cut off. He lifts his eyes and his joined hands to heaven. He prays God to grant him paradise. Then he dies the warrior of Charles. "By great battles and very beautiful sermons he was during all his life a champion against the pagans. May God grant him His holy benediction."

"Roland is down on his back, fainting, for death approaches. A pagan who had pretended to be dead, tries to take his sword Durendal. But Roland smites with his ivory horn upon the gilded helm adorned with gems and breaks the steel and the skull so that the eyes start out of the dead man's head. Roland tries in vain to shatter against a stone his sword Durendal, the beautiful and holy in whose golden pommel are a tooth of St. Peter, blood of St. Basil, hairs of St. Denis, and a piece of the garment of Holy Mary. He turns his face toward Spain that Charles may say he died a conqueror. He confesses his sins and holds out his glove toward God, who sends his angels Cherubim and St. Michel and St. Gabriel. They carry the soul of Count Roland to Paradise."

The rest of the poem, a little over a third, describes the army of Charles and the terrible vengeance he takes upon the Saracens under the guidance of an angel; "the one who was wont to talk with him." According to the angel's promises, the sun stops its course in heaven to light the pursuit. All the pagans are killed or drowned in the Ebro and the wearied Christians sleep where they stand. Even the horses are so weary that they graze lying down.

A fresh army coming in ships from Arabia attacks Charles while he is burying his dead chevaliers. The Emperor sets ten corps of his army in array, and, with his white beard spreading outside his neck armour, rides against the Arabians thirty corps strong. The smallest

has fifty thousand men. They fight all day. Many Christian barons fall and, at evening, the pagan Emir, with his beard white as a thorn blossom floating outside his neck piece, meets the Emperor face to face. They unhorse each other and fight on foot. The pagan cuts through the helmet to the hair and lays bare the bone. Charles staggers, but the voice of the angel Gabriel recalls him to consciousness. He strikes with the sword of France, crushes the Emir's helmet, gleaming with jewels, and splits his head down to the white beard.

With this "beautiful blow" the battle ends, except for the slaughter. The pagan king Marsile dies of grief and gives his soul to the worst devils. Charles breaks down the gate of Saragossa and smashes all the idols. The pagans are led to the place of baptism. If any refuses the King has him hung or burnt. Many more than a hundred thousand are baptized true Christians.

When Charles gets back to Aix, two persons come before him. The first is Aude, a beautiful damsel who was to marry Roland. Charles weeps and pulls his white beard as he tells of Roland's death. He offers in marriage his own son Louis, new guardian of the Spanish March. But Aude says: "God forbid that I should live after Roland's death" and falls dead at Charlemagne's feet. Ganelon, the felon, in chains, is fastened by thongs of deer hide to a stake in front of the palace and serfs beat him. Charles demands from his assembled vassals judgment on a traitor who sold twenty thousand French and the twelve peers for money. Ganelon replies: "Roland hated me and condemned me to death. He had me sent as a messenger to King Marsile. By my skill I saved myself. I avenged me, but that was not treason." Thirty of his relatives stand by him and one, Pinabel, demands the right to prove by wager of battle Ganelon's innocence. The barons recommend the acquittal of Ganelon and Charles tells them they are felons. He bends his head in sorrow

because all have failed him. But Thierry, brother of an Angevin duke, says: "Even if Roland had wronged Ganelon, Ganelon is perjured towards the King and ought to be hung." The two champions take the sacrament and leave great offerings in the churches. They mount their horses before Charles. "Then a hundred thousand chevaliers wept, who for love of Roland had pity on Thierry. What the end will be God knows well." Thierry kills Pinabel. By the advice of the barons, a hundred sergeants drag off the thirty relatives of Ganelon and hang them. "He who betrays damns others besides himself." Ganelon is torn to pieces by four war horses tied to his hands and feet.

This poem concerns real people whose names were preserved in the sanctuaries placed along the pilgrim routes, but of course it does not tell us what really happened in the days of Charlemagne. It is, however, a historic document, for it records the good and evil in that feudal aristocracy out of whose lives grew finally the ideal of chivalry: which, like most ideals, lighted the lives of generations without controlling them. It shows us their ferocity, admiring the arms red with blood of the champion who splits men in half with one blow. It shows us the pride of caste which uses "son of a serf" as the equivalent of modern terms of the deepest opprobrium. Hatred and cruelty are unveiled in it. There are strange contradictions in the lives of these men, who sincerely die as martyrs of Christ. The barons unhesitatingly endorse the rightfulness of vengeance though the basal quality of a Christian is forgiveness. The archbishop who lays aside the staff of the Good Shepherd for the sword, to die in a circle of slain Saracens, breaks the canons of the Church and no one remembers them. The pious and holy Emperor offers his captives the choice of the stake or the baptismal bowl. The thirty innocent relatives of the traitor Ganelon are killed with him in stark denial of Christian teaching about the relation of each soul to God.

But he must be blind indeed who sees only those traits in the confession of the French chivalry of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The love of country is in it; a deep affection for "sweet France," "the beautiful," "the holy." The courage of these men is unlimited. The sense of duty to their lords sends them gladly to death. Their affection makes these half savage fighters weep over their friends; as, centuries before, the bandit chief David wept at parting from Jonathan. They die in penitence for their sins, holding out to the Divine Master the glove of a servitor loyal according to his lights.

The French heroic epic, of which great numbers were composed in response to a popular demand, degenerated slowly as it was sung at fairs, city festivals, and before other less chosen audiences. Sentimentalism gradually undermined its naive strength. A touch of melodrama crept into it, playing for tears over persecuted innocence or young heroes struggling for years against misfortune. It fell a victim to the need for happy endings and its vulgarizers even brought into it a comic element. But before it declined and died, it had a powerful and widespread influence within and without France.

At the time when the heroic epic was taking shape in the north, there arose, in the south of France, another type of poetry; written in the language known as the *langue d'oc*. This poetry is often called in our day Provençal, though it was produced not simply in what is now Provence but all over the south of France; which, up to the thirteenth century, differed from the north not only in speech but also in habits. In addition it was extremely independent of the control of the king at Paris. The poetry of the south had its origin in song and the minstrels from whose songs it developed were called troubadours or singers. It was addressed, like the heroic epic of the north, to the nobility and its authors were themselves noble; especially at the beginning of the school. Twenty-three of them were reigning princes. It was mainly lyri-

cal and its chief subject was not war but love. The object of the poet's admiration was always a married woman, generally of a higher rank than his own and the passion he expressed for her was platonic and immaterial, or at least hopeless. This feeling rapidly became conventionalized, developed complicated and difficult forms of verse, and probably seldom seemed more profoundly sincere to the ladies to whom it was addressed, than it does to most modern readers.

Marriage with an heiress of a neighbouring fief was, especially in the south, where the succession of women was early established, a common road toward family aggrandizement, and in this platonic, or semi-platonic attitude of a lover, there was a relief for starved feeling; or, at least, an agreeable pastime for great nobles who were beginning to fight less and dance more. This poetry which made the centre of the life of the castle not the sword of the lord but the smile of the lady, came to be called "courtly" poetry.

The first of the troubadours, and some think the most truly poetical among them, was William IX, Duke of Aquitaine (born 1071). His granddaughter and heiress, Eleanor, first queen of Louis VII of France, brought the taste for "courtly" poetry to the north of France and it was probably her influence which taught her son Richard the Lionhearted of England to dabble in the highly fashionable verse. The troubadours did not always sing of love in a light or formal vein, but when they became serious their poetry, as is often the case with literature addressed exclusively to the highest social circles, is tinged with melancholy or cynicism.

About the middle of the twelfth century appeared the first of the rhymed romances written to be read and not sung, which rapidly became very numerous and popular. These are classified by modern writers under the heads of Romances of Antiquity, Breton Romances, and Ro-

mances of Adventure. The authors of the first sort rewrote and feudalized classic models. The writers of the Breton romances, the first of which appeared at the beginning of the thirteenth century, were the transmitters to other lands of the legends of Arthur and the Round Table. Some of them wrote in a prose which Dante admired. It is even said that he found in it a stimulus to writing in Italian the *Convita* and the *Vita Nuova.* They also introduced into chivalric stories an element of "courtesy" and respect for women borrowed from the troubadours which softened the savagery at the base even of the noblest heroic epics. This "courtesy" became a strong element in the chivalric ideal as it appears in its best form in the work of an Englishman, Mallory, written two hundred years later. The romances of adventure find their background in any age or country and always tell the story of two lovers. They are sentimental and not feudal. Their dominant passion is not the love of fighting and the ideals of their readers are a long way from the savagery and also from the noble and manly virtues, of the Song of Roland.

Between poetic fiction intended to be sung and prose fiction intended to be read aloud, there was evidently an intermediate form called the *chantefable;* a prose story to be told with interludes of song. Only one specimen has been preserved, which dates from the end of the period we are now considering and it may be guessed that the reason for its preservation is its unique appealing charm. It is one of those products of human feeling which men do not willingly allow to disappear even though they forget the name of the author. The exquisite little romance, written in prose even more poetic than its verse, is not only mingled with a lyric element but also touched by dramatic method; for two-thirds of it is extremely vivacious dialogue. A brilliant writer on French literature says of it: "Aucassin and Nicolette is a specimen of a sort of liter-

ature entirely different from the Song of Roland, but it may be put beside it. For it is, without doubt, the work which posterity will preserve as the most representative of French poetical feeling in the Middle Ages."

The Romance contains some nine thousand words and the writer has attempted in one tenth of that length to suggest the tastes and sentiments of those for whom it was written.

The Count of Valence was waging war on the Count of Beaucaire. He wasted his country and killed his people. The Count of Beaucaire had had his day. He was old and feeble. So he called Aucassin, his heir, and bade him take his arms, mount his horse and defend his land and people. The young man refuses unless his father will give him "Nicolette my dear sweetheart whom I love so well." The father replies that Nicolette is only a captive whom the Viscount of the city, his vassal, bought from the Saracens when she was a small child. One of these days he will marry her to someone less than a knight and more than a squire. "She is not for you. If you want a wife, I will give you the daughter of a king or a count."

So the father goes to Nicolette's godfather and orders him to put Nicolette out of sight "and understand well if I can lay hands on her I will burn her at the stake." The Vicomte was a very rich man and had a very fine palace where he locked Nicolette up in a high room. Aucassin goes to see the Viscount, who insists that Nicolette is no match for him. "And if you made her your mistress you would go to hell and never get to paradise." "What have I to do in paradise? I don't want to go there. Nobody goes to paradise but old priests and the maimed and lame who creep day and night around the altars, or those who go about barefoot in old worn cloaks and die of hunger and thirst and cold and miseries. That is the sort that goes to heaven. I have nothing to do with them but I want to go to hell. Because to hell goes the clergyman

who is a good fellow and knights of the right sort who are killed in tournaments and in noble wars, and good squires and gentlemen. And there go the beautiful ladies well bred in courtesy, who have two or three lovers besides their baron. And thither go the gold and the silver and the costly furs and there go the minstrels and harpers and the kings of the world. With those I want to go, but I must have Nicolette my very dear sweetheart with me."

"Well," said the Viscount, "it is no use talking about her, for you will never see her, for if you did and your father knew it, he would burn her and me."

Very sorrowfully Aucassin left the Vicomte. The father is much pressed by the enemy and Aucassin finally agrees to fight on condition that if he returns from battle he may kiss Nicolette once. He fights like a wild boar surrounded by the dogs, kills ten knights, wounds seven and takes the Count of Valence prisoner. But his father refuses to keep his promise and adds that he would burn the girl if he had her.

"Is that all?" asks Aucassin. "Yes, by God," said the father. "Surely," said Aucassin, "it makes me sad when a man of your age lies. Count of Valence, are you my prisoner?" "Yes, indeed, sire," says the Count. "Give me your hand," says Aucassin. "Willingly, sire," and he put his hand in his. "Swear to me," says Aucassin, "that so long as you live you will never lose a single chance to bring shame or trouble in person or goods on my father."

"Sire," he says, "in God's name don't make mock of me, but put me to ransom. You could not ask so much in gold or silver nor warhorses nor the finest furs, nor dogs, nor hawks, that I will not give it."

"How is that?" says Aucassin, "don't you confess you are my prisoner?" "Yes, sire," answers the Count of Valence. "Now by God," says Aucassin, "if you do not swear it, I will cut off your head." "In the name of

God," says he, "I will promise you whatever you want." "So he swore it, and Aucassin gave him a horse to mount, and mounting another, conducted him to safety."

So Aucassin, like Nicolette, was shut up. But Nicolette, one night when the moon shone in her window and the nightingale sang in the garden, saw that the old woman who guarded her slept. So she made a rope of sheets and table linen and slipped down it. "She was dressed in a silken gown and she lifted her dress with one hand in front and the other behind for she saw much dew on the grass. Her hair was blond in little crisp ringlets, her merry eyes were grey blue, her face long and her nose arched. Her lips were redder than any cherry or rose in summer and her little teeth white. Her waist was so slender that you could circle it with your two hands. The daisies she broke with her toes when they fell upon her instep seemed to be black against her feet and legs, so white was the dear little girl."

She makes her way to the base of Aucassin's tower and tells him she is going to the ends of the world. Scaling the broken wall she got across the moat with torn and bleeding hands and found her way into a huge forest near by; ninety miles across each way and full of serpents and lions. On the edge of it, she meets some shepherd lads who take her for a fairy. They refuse to carry a cryptic message to Aucassin, but, when she gives them five pennies to buy gingerbread and pipes for dancing, they agree to tell him if he comes along.

Meanwhile it has become noised abroad that Nicolette has left the country. The Count of Beaucaire lets his son out of prison and makes a feast for him. But Aucassin slips away, and, on the advice of a friendly knight, rides toward the forest. On its border he finds the shepherds, who are rude at first but finally tell him of a young girl "so beautiful we thought we saw a fairy," and her message to him to hunt in the forest.

So he finds Nicolette in a bower she had built, takes her on his horse and they make their way far off. They have some strange adventures which supply a touch of buffoonery, and spend three years at the Castle of Torelore, for whose king Aucassin fights. But Saracens storm the castle and put Aucassin and Nicolette in different ships. The ship of Aucassin was wrecked hard by the castle of Beaucaire and the people, rushing down to plunder it, recognized with joy their young lord; for his father and mother were dead. So they took him to the castle and "he ruled his fiefs in peace."

When Nicolette saw the walls of Carthage she remembered she was a daughter of the King, carried off when she was an infant. So they gave her great honour and planned to marry her to a rich pagan king. But she blackened her face and disguised herself as a minstrel with shirt and breeches and cloak and bribed a mariner to take her across to Provence. She made her way to Beaucaire and sang to the lord a lay of Aucassin and Nicolette and how Nicolette was in Carthage. Aucassin gave the minstrel twenty livres and bade her fetch Nicolette, for he would never have any other wife. Nicolette went to her godmother, the Viscountess, who helped her to get the stain off her face and dressed her in rich silks. Then the Viscountess went to Aucassin and found him weeping for Nicolette. And the lady said, "Aucassin, lament no more, but come with me and I will show you what you love most in the world, for it is Nicolette, your dear sweetheart who has come from far off lands to seek you."

"And Aucassin was glad."

These three forms of French literature, whether of the north or south, the heroic epic, the poetry of the troubadours, and the romances, exercised a great influence outside of France. They spread naturally to England; for Norman-French remained during two generations after the death of Philip Augustus the language of Eng-

lish aristocratic circles, and, for nearly three generations more, the official language of the law courts. The English vernacular poets of the thirteenth century "who probably spoke French as readily as their native English," imitated in form and in spirit French models and this influence remained so strong that the first great English poet Chaucer, born more than a hundred years after the death of Philip Augustus, began his literary career as an imitator of French poetry.

More remarkable was the influence of this French literature of the twelfth and early thirteenth century on the countries to the east and north of France. Heroic epics were translated into Dutch, German, Swedish, Norwegian, Icelandic, Bohemian, Italian and Spanish. They spread to Hungary and Greece. The songs of the troubadours from the valley of the Rhone, were a source of the inspiration of the minnesingers on the banks of the Rhine, and German writers translated or imitated French romances of all sorts. In Italy the troubadours were received with open arms by the great lords whose descendants were to become the tyrants of the chief cities, and their poems were imitated by a number of native troubadours. French romances of all the types were translated into Italian or read by the nobles in the original, and Dante makes his celebrated scene between Francesco and Paolo center on reading in a Breton romance the story of Lancelot. Dante himself shows marked signs of the influence of the "courtly" poetry of the troubadours and praises one of them "as the greatest of all those who have sung of love."

What Matthew Arnold said was even then true: "The great place of France in the world is very much due to her gift for social life and this gift French literature has accompanied, fashioned, perfected and continues to reflect."

CHAPTER XIV

POPULARIZING LEARNED BOOKS. THE THEATRE. THE FABLIAUX

Alongside of this production of fiction, in verse and prose, there was produced in French a serious literature. Learned books did not, indeed, appear in the new literary medium, for all who would care for them could read Latin. But certain works of vulgarization, popular encyclopedias, were translated. For example, there appeared a rhymed translation of the Latin Physiologus, a sort of manual of natural history mingled with an allegorical religious dictionary which explains for instance why Christ is like a lion or a unicorn. This book, written before the barbarian invasions of the fifth century, continued in a third language the career of popularity which made it the most widely circulated book next to the Bible.

Many translations and paraphrases of various books of the Old and New Testaments appeared in the twelfth century. Even more numerous were the translations of Latin lives of the saints or compilations of the miracles of the Virgin Mary. Rhymed sermons also appeared; some written by laymen. These tended to become didactic poems like the Dialogue between the Body and the Soul written about 1150. The soul reproaches the body of a dying man for having led it astray. The body replies, "You had reason and ought to have controlled my perverse instincts. Now sin must be expiated." "How long," asks the soul, "will the punishment last?" "When thy tears," replies the Body, "falling at the rate of a single drop a year shall match the ocean, then we shall only be at the beginning of our punishment."

The French theatre had its roots in religion and the

first dramatic performances were given by the clergy. The earliest of these little dramas or pageants were partly in Latin and partly in the vernacular. Their subjects were biblical like the Three Wise Men, The Wise and Foolish Virgins, Daniel in the Lion's Den, etc. One of the earliest specimen of these religious stage plays, written entirely in French, dates from about the end of the twelfth century and sets forth the mystery of the fall of Adam in versified dialogue helped by the songs of a choir. It is accompanied by elaborate stage directions in Latin, which suggests that it was acted by the clergy. It was probably played on the square in front of the church.

Out of these mysteries grew the miracle plays, based on the lives of the saints. These were not intended for the church. They were written for the laity and given by fraternities or students on the feast days of saints. If we can judge by one remarkable specimen which has survived (Le Jeu de St. Nicholas of the early thirteenth century) they were written with a freedom the authors of the mysteries would have shrunk from using. Tragedy and farce are mingled in it, pagans and crusaders, saints and thieves, appear in this play of a dramatic writer of originality and power.

The reigns of Louis VII and Philip Augustus saw the rise of the burghers to wealth and power. They saw also the development of a sort of literature addressed directly to this new class: the fabliaux. These were short stories intended to provoke laughter. Although written in verse they were recited and not sung. About one hundred and fifty have survived, of which about sixty per cent are anonymous. A very large number have undoubtedly been lost. The oldest is dated in the middle of the reign of Louis VII (1159). Many of them are quite short, but they are distinguished from the romances by other characteristics besides length. They treat of episodes and no stress is laid on the character of the hero or heroine.

The heroic epics were written for the nobles, but, as they began to spread to other classes because they were sung at fairs or at the houses of rich burghers, comic relief was brought in. Out of these episodes brought into heroic poems grew the fabliaux: a poetry of the street corner and the banquet of the merchants guild, instead of the tent of the chevalier or the feast in the hall of the château. For the rich burgher wanted his amusements too and the poet earned his gold pieces by giving him something dealing with familiar scenes and people, simple, often coarse, fitted to set the table in a roar. They show a gift of exact and delicate observation, vivacity of expression, a light and gay spirit which, in its eagerness to laugh, forgets moral scruple. The most brilliant writer on the fabliaux calls them "excellent witnesses to the lower qualities of our race."

Here is one of the shortest and simplest of them. "A priest bestriding his nag was reading his prayer book as he jogged along the road. A hedge covered with ripe blackberries growing on the other side of a deep ditch tempts the good man. So he forces his horse into the ditch and stands on the saddle in order to reach the fruit and eat his fill. 'Good Lord!' he thinks to himself, 'if some one were to say "Get up." ' He thinks it and says it at the same moment and his horse starts on the run leaving him among the brambles in the ditch."

Many of the fabliaux are wittier than this, but few are as innocent. For they are the outcome of what is known as the *esprit gaulois;* and the *esprit gaulois,* a spirit of gaiety, slightly malicious without meaning to hurt, inclined to impertinent familiarity not intended to insult, lightly vulgar, a mocking antic spirit which loves to play around the subject of sexual passion like Puck skipping over a quagmire, was capable, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, as it now is in some of the theatres of Paris, of forgetting its lighter, redeeming qualities and

dabbling heavily in the mire. At the beginning of the thirteenth century there was a double exchange of literature up and down between the classes of French society. But, while the heroic epic and the romance composed for the nobles in an elevated tone free from vulgarity had to be adjusted to their new hearers at the fair, or the banquet of the rich merchant, there is nothing to indicate that the dwellers in the châteaux who wished to hear what their burgher neighbours thought so funny, required that any of the fabliaux should be denaturized. On the other hand, internal evidence shows beyond a doubt that some of the grossest were sometimes recited before the lord and the ladies of his family. There is nothing peculiarly French or restricted to the thirteenth century about this. The goddess of lubricity finds her devotees in all ages and countries and no class refuses to worship her. Ovid and Catullus wrote their lowest lines for the highest society of Rome and the most blatant indecencies of the stage of Charles II were presented before the lords and ladies of England. Nor is genius a sure defense against her influence. Boccaccio and Chaucer use pornographic tales without hesitation.

Women, though they tolerated the worst feature of the fabliaux, could hardly have liked them, because most of them express the most brutal contempt for woman; a sentiment common to "half the works of their epoch." The stick is recommended by the majority of writers as the best means of getting on well with a wife because "woman is a weather cock, twisting and turning like a squirrel in a forest, she flees and slips away like an eel or a snake. In the day time she is a lark, at night a bat. Woman is a lion to rule and a mouse to hide, a winter day which is a night, lightning which burns everything, a falcon to seize his prey. Woman, like hell, is always thirsty. As soon as she is well fitted out and has a fine dress, a belt with a silver buckle, a bag to hang at it, and

a feathered hat, how she despises her husband! She causes strife between father and son, between friend and friend. She burns castles and makes the trumpets sound for war. She it is who makes knives leap from their sheaths."

To get a complete picture of the age this type of literature in which woman never appears as wife, mother, or sister, but always as the crafty cheater of a dull husband, must be put alongside of the songs of the troubadours and compared with that respect for woman which reached its climax when Dante found in Beatrice the guide God sent to his soul.

About the middle of the twelfth century there began to appear in the vernacular another form of literature which, like the heroic epic, the lyrics of the troubadours and the romances, sought its patrons among the aristocracy. The earliest histories written in the vernacular were, like the fiction, in verse and they were translations or paraphrases from the Latin. But before the end of the century, a rhymed biography of Thomas à Becket, the murdered Archbishop of Canterbury, was based by its author on personal testimony and authentic documents. A few years later a Norman poet wrote a similar life of the Earl of Pembroke, who had been Regent of England for three years before his death. From the same time we have also a chronicle of the Scotch war and of the crusade of Richard the Lionhearted; for the earliest French historiography seems to have addressed itself to Anglo-Norman hearers. It was probably intended to be read aloud.

The earliest fragment of history written in French prose is a sort of journal by one Ernoul, a humble crusader of the third crusade. The first important original work written in prose is the *Memoirs of Geoffroi de Villehardouin* which gives an account of the fourth crusade, with whose leaders he had much influence. It begins to

display those qualities of logical and symmetrical arrangement, together with clarity of expression, which are today such invariable characteristics not only of the best, but of the average, French historiography. Villehardouin does more than tell us the events which led to the conquest of Christian Constantinople. Without trying to do so, he gives us also a picture of the dominant class of his day, the chevaliers or feudal nobles, small and great. On his pages we see recorded the results in conduct of that chivalry, toward the formation of which, between 1100 and 1250, men living in the borders of modern France contributed more than any other people.

CHAPTER XV

SOCIAL CREATIONS. THE FRIARS. CHIVALRY. THE GOOD AND EVIL OF THE AGE

Before observing the history of the social and poetic ideal of chivalry, to whose creation the French contributed more than any other nation, we must notice briefly another order of knight errants who did not mount armed and spurred to ride to battle but walked barefooted to make peace.

The rise of the burghers in wealth brought with it an increase in the urban population and with larger cities came a new intellectual ferment leading to heresies. Slums formed also, crowded with poor people without even the saving anchorage to the land of the serf. To meet this situation, to combat heresy, misery and ignorance, a new monastic movement appeared in the beginning of the thirteenth century, which created a new sort of monk; the friar or brother. The first monks of Cluny left the world—the Church world as well as the lay world—to save their own souls and pray for mankind. When they became popes or the helpers of popes, they felt it was something aside from their intention, something forced upon them by the providence of God. St. Bernard, when he was travelling about Christendom preaching to vast crowds, thought his true place was in his monastery of Clairvaux, rising for worship at midnight and joining his fellow monks many times every twenty-four hours in chanting the psalms and in prayer. Whatever the Cluniacs and Cistercians had done for the world—and they had done much—it was not in their original programme. But the founders of the friars believed that "service is prayer" and sought the path to salvation in following

Christ as he went about doing good. They expected their followers to live, not in convents, but anywhere among men where their work was. The order was to own nothing and its members were to live by the labour of their hands; begging when this did not suffice for the bare needs of life.

The origin of neither of the two great orders of friars was French: St. Dominic, who devoted his followers to preaching and teaching to defend the truth, was a Spaniard; St. Francis, who sent his "little brothers" out to preach to the poor and care for them, was a true son of Italy. But their orders spread rapidly in France, which, before the middle of the thirteenth century, was covered with their monasteries. For in direct contradiction to the wishes of their founders, the friars soon began to acquire monasteries. These monasteries were not like those of the older orders, in the country and surrounded by broad lands they owned, but in the cities where their work was and where they could find alms. The older orders were rural but these orders of the new style were always urban, and they soon began to produce numbers of learned members. The Dominicans held their annual assembly alternately in Bologna and Paris, the two great university cities of the world.

Chivalry was an ideal of character and a code of morals and manners, whose prohibitions, though unwritten, were as definite as the things "which are not done by gentlemen" of modern times. It was intended only for the aristocratic landholding class and their sons, who were also the professional fighting class; distinguished from all other soldiers by their use of the horse. The caballero of Spain, the cavaliere of Italy, the chevalier of France, and the ritter (riding man) of German speaking peoples was, normally, as inseparable from his war horse as a Pawnee warrior from his mustang pony. The spur finally took its place alongside the sword as a symbolic implement

whose solemn ceremonial conferring made a man a chevalier. In one of the twelfth century romances of chivalry, Lancelot, riding to save his lady, loses his horse and finally, after serious hesitation, consents to ride in a cart "in spite of his pride and the opprobrium which attaches to such an action."* The need of horses and costly armour made the connection between feudalism and chivalry very close at first, but, as the institution developed, every fiefholder was not necessarily a chevalier, and there were many bachelor knights who held no land in fief but lived by the service of some great lord. The loosening of this originally close connection between chivalry and feudalism was quite largely brought about by the crusades, which were also the cause of the knightly orders, a combination of the monastic and chivalric ideals. The chief duty of their members was, not to pray but to fight, for Christianity against the infidel, and the first of them, the order of Knights Templars, was founded by two French chevaliers early in the twelfth century.

These fighting orders were, in a way, only a much more formally organized and specialized form of the great international fraternity of knights or chevaliers. Custom prescribed a long training to qualify for this unorganized fraternity. It usually lasted from about the age of eight to the age of twenty-two, when the young man who had served his mistress faithfully in peace as a page, and his master bravely in war as a squire, was thought fit to be initiated into the lay fraternity of knights. The ceremonies of initiation as described in later romances are very elaborate, but were probably seldom carried out in full detail. They expressed the two elements and, up to the twelfth century, the only two elements, influential in moulding chivalry. The first of these was barbaric in origin, for the Roman equites bear no resemblance to the

*The English knights, however, following the example of their Saxon ancestors, rode to the battlefield but fought on foot.

chevaliers except their name. The Franks, like many savage tribes to-day, marked the entry of a young man into the ranks of the warriors by ceremonies and we find Charlemagne solemnly girding his sons with the sword before they wore the crown. The chief symbol of this reception into the ranks of fighting men, was the accolade or blow, at first of the fist, later of the flat of the sword blade, given to the aspirant by an older chevalier. From this element came the emphasis upon the fundamental quality of human nature: courage. The true chevalier must be afraid only of being thought afraid.

Another quality he was expected to show was loyalty to his oath of homage. Even in the constant feudal wars, to kill a liege lord, or even to strike him in battle, was regarded by the chevaliers of the eleventh century as dishonourable. This feudal loyalty was accompanied by a refusal to put treacherous craft alongside courage as a warrior's virtue. The early chevalier made vengeance a sort of sacred right, but he wanted to give his enemy an equal chance to meet him man to man in fair fight. Even when he used successful treachery, the sentiment of his fellows prevented him from being proud of it; like, for instance, his Frankish ancestors, or those Italian princes of the fifteenth century, whose ideals are summarized by Machiavelli. The practice of the crusaders was not to attack even the infidel without a formal defiance. Whereas the contemporary Byzantine Greeks fought most treacherously.

The second element in the formation of the chivalric ideal was the influence of the Church. The clergy claimed a part in the ceremonies of initiation of the new fraternity of chevaliers. The priest said: "Receive this blade in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost and use it in self-defense and the protection of the Holy Church and to confound the enemies of Christ and religion." Widows, orphans, and pilgrims, the special wards of the

Church, were placed under the protection of the chevaliers, who were expected to do justice to the poor and weak and to love mercy to the fallen. They evidently found it harder to put on these evangelic virtues than to learn the military virtues developed by feudalism. There were many seigneurs who oppressed their poor villains, and vengeance frequently stifled mercy. Richard, King of England, that *preux chevalier* of the end of the twelfth century, pardoned on his deathbed the soldier who had given the fatal wound. But one of Richard's captains caught the man afterward and had him flayed alive. There are many instances of the fact that kings and nobles of the age of chivalry, when their passions were stirred, plunged without shame into brutal cruelty. The Church itself practically bestowed her blessing on cruelty to infidels or heretics and when Richard of England massacred twenty-seven hundred Saracen prisoners in cold blood because their ransom was not paid as agreed, he was not rebuked by the Church. Neverthless the ideal of justice and mercy, blessed by the Church, not only helped those who loved it but restrained those who disliked it.

A third element which finally entered into the ideal of chivalry was what is known as *courtoisie*. The chevaliers of the eleventh century loved roast oxen and flagons of wine (though without drunkenness); they rode horses to death in the hunt, they fought their neighbours, they listened to minstrels, but, after their return from the first and especially the second crusade, the lives of a certain chosen few began to expand. Some of them became great builders of châteaux and churches. To the desire for splendour and rough plenty of their fathers, succeeded a more refined and delicate way of conceiving life. They had brought back from the eastern Mediterranean not only the wonderful work of the Saracen weapon-smiths, but rugs, embroideries, carvings, metal work, and a taste for beauty in daily living, which made them ready pa-

trons of the artistic handicrafts. By the last third of the eleventh century, some little nobles began, like the father of Abelard, to desire for their sons training in books as well as in arms. The songs or jests of the minstrels grew into a rich and varied literature, at first designed for the castle of the seigneur. For this more refined way of living, *courtoisie,* which made manners important for the chevalier and imposed upon him an unwritten code in peace as well as in war, the troubadours found a centre and symbol in the honour to be paid to woman.

These three elements then, the warlike virtues of a fierce but manly fighting caste, the attempt to use them in a softened form for the service of Christianity (an attempt much weakened by the teaching of cruel intolerance) and, finally, the refining influence of woman, were the constituent elements in the social ideal of the dominant class in European society from about 1100 until about 1250.

The third of these elements, the idea of a courtly life centered in the influence of woman, had much to do with the spread of the chivalric ideal from France to the rest of the world. Alwin Schultz says:* "Just as our German poets took the material and the models of their poetry from the French—as the French style of architecture made its way into Germany and soon into the whole Catholic world, just as the French tongue was, at that time, spoken or at least understood by educated people everywhere, so it became the imperative fashion to serve dinners, to make clothes, to arrange the whole life of the court in French style." "It was in France that the more refined forms of social intercourse had their origin and, from France, the other nations eagerly adopted them."

The chivalric ideal in its complete and most refined form, which prescribed gentle manners for the man of gentle birth, was, like other ideals, not always realized in fact. The love of the courtly life of chivalry was not

* *Das Hofische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesinger.* Einleitung.

always the semi-platonic affection of the troubadour's verses. "No age of the world ever had its eyes more fixed upon the material reality of pleasure and neither its men nor its women were satisfied with mere adoration and languishing."

That the ferocity which underlay chivalry was not eliminated by the refining influence of woman is shown by the amusement chivalric society loved best. The first tournament was arranged by a French knight, Godefroi de Preuilly, about the middle of the eleventh century, and, during the twelfth century, the sport spread to Italy, England and the Low Countries. In the fourteenth century, new regulations and the ingenuity of weapon smiths made it a gorgeous spectacular game in which death was rather rare. But every man who rode in a tourney of the twelfth century risked his life and no tournament was without killing or maiming. No such fatal sport has been practised anywhere in any age. At the tourney of Neuss in 1240 more than sixty knights were killed. Because of its savagery and the danger involved, three general councils of the Church solemnly forbade "the detestable practice" of tournaments. But, notwithstanding this fatality, and, in spite of the prohibition of the Church, the noble ladies who sat in the tribunes found in the splendid but brutal spectacle the same excited delight the Roman ladies found in the still bloodier sports of the arena. The men loved it with the passion of those who thought the labours of war and the fatigues of hunting the only ones honourable for a gentleman.

The Good and Evil of the Age

The brilliant French achievements of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries in contributing so much to the early development of scholasticism, in founding "the mother of universities" at Paris, in creating a vernacular literature which gave models and a strong impulse to that

of many other peoples, in forming the social ideal of chivalry, in creating for the world a new style of architecture, in founding solidly the liberties of her cities, in giving the king more power to replace violence by law—ought not to prevent us from seeing the other side of the picture of life in the bounds of modern France under Louis VII and Philip Augustus (1137–1223). It has made writers, both in French and English, shut their eyes to many facts of that epoch; an epoch at once splendid and miserable.

The violence of the feudal nobles was by no means everywhere repressed. In the centre, the south and the valley of the Rhone the royal bailiffs did not dare to show themselves and the old feudal anarchy, where every powerful noble claimed the privilege of doing what was right in his own eyes, went on. A certain number of barons trod under foot the chivalric ideal. Like, for example, that little seigneur in Perigord who left one hundred and fifty men and women prisoners in a monastery with their hands and feet cut off or their eyes put out. Some of the poets found good material in such brutality. One writing toward the close of the twelfth century describes his hero as tearing out the heart of an enemy and throwing it into the face of a vassal saying: "Here take the heart of your friend. You can roast and eat it." Many seigneurs, far from doing justice and showing mercy to their people, bitterly oppressed them. A great preacher wrote: "The chevalier plunders his subjects by unlawful taxes and heavy exactions. By using the right of *main-morte* he plunders the dead, condemns the orphan to die of hunger and acts like the rats who live by eating corpses. . . . When the chevalier has despoiled his men, the agents of the great seigneur, like carrion crows of hell, come joyfully to get what is left. These officers, as rapacious as their masters, oppress and are oppressed in turn. These leeches after sucking the blood of the wretched are compelled to disgorge for the profit of the man above."

The age was extremely religious and it saw the rapid spread of the friars devoted to the care of the poor and the teaching of truth. But even the most devoted adherents of the mediæval ideal of religion ought not to be blind to the signs of crass superstition. The veneration of miracle working relics caused the most absurd exaggerations. A little priory acquired in thirty-three years besides twenty-five relics of other saints, two teeth of the prophet Amos, relics of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, pieces of the dress of the Virgin Mary, some of the incense the wise men brought to Bethlehem and one church claimed to have one of the tears shed by Jesus at the grave of Lazarus. It was not to be wondered at that the council of the Lateran in 1215 ordered the prelates "not to permit those who come to their churches to venerate the remains of the saints to be cheated by doubtful relics."

One of the scourges of the times was fire in the cities; built largely of wood. In five years Rouen burnt six times. In 1188 seven important cities were destroyed by fire. No organized effort was made to check or prevent these conflagrations. Every great lord had in the army with which he intermittently fought his neighbours, "firemen" trained to the business-like destruction of the enemies' villages: but of firemen in our modern sense there is no trace.

Because of the lack of the most elementary sanitation, the population was repeatedly killed in large numbers by the plague. The leprosy also, brought back by the crusaders, attacked both rich and poor. It spread over France, England, Germany and Spain and there were finally in those countries thousands of houses for the segregation of lepers.

Famines, though less prevalent than in the tenth or eleventh centuries, were intermittent and in the reign of Philip Augustus there were eleven; one of which lasted four years.

Famine played a large part in producing brigandage

which existed in central France during the whole reign of Philip Augustus. Veritable armies of brigands were formed, largely filled by ex-soldiers, and the plundering took on such proportions that fraternities known as the White Hoods were formed to suppress it. These, at first, included not only burghers and peasants but barons, bishops and clergymen. In Auvergne one of these fraternities slaughtered in 1183 three thousand of these *routiers,* or organized bandits, and a little later the united White Hoods of three provinces massacred ten thousand bandits; recovering great booty, including a pile of crucifixes and gold and silver chalices taken from churches. Later the White Hoods were suspected of democracy and heresy and suppressed by the bishops and seigneurs. Some of them were pitilessly massacred.

PERIOD 5

THE KING THE CENTRE OF FRANCE

From Saint Louis to the End of the Capetian Dynasty
1226 to 1328

A. Saint Louis the Incarnation of the Kingly Ideal.
B. The French People Back the Crown against the Papacy.
C. A Century of Development in Government and Literature (1226–1328).

Chapters XVI, XVII, XVIII.

CHAPTER XVI

SAINT LOUIS THE INCARNATION OF THE KINGLY IDEAL

Louis IX was the most remarkable personality among the rulers of France from Charlemagne to Napoleon. If he had not been called the Saint he ought to have been called the Great. His piety naturally showed itself in the manner of his times, a manner strongly tinged by the monastic ideal. He rose at midnight to pray. Lying down half dressed, he was wakened an hour after sunrise for morning prayer; after which he heard at least two masses. Five times during the day he heard or read short prayers and before going to bed repeated the Ave Maria fifty times. When he was reproached for spending so much time in worship he answered that if he, like other kings, spent twice as much time in playing dice or hunting, no one would say anything about it. To his prayers he added what were known as exercises of mortification. He insisted on having lepers brought to see him and fed them with his own hands. He carried this practice of self mortification with him to table. He detested beer and could not avoid making a face when he tasted it, so he drank it always during Lent. During the rest of the year he put much water into wine of which he was fond. With the same idea of denying the carnal man, he was very apt to pour water into any especially delicious sauce served by his cooks. Every day, so far as possible, he read in the Bible or the Church Fathers. His friend and biographer Joinville wrote of him: "No layman of our times lived so devoutly during the whole of his days."

Similar expressions of devotion were not uncommon among other princes. Henry III of England, for ex-

ample, spent more time in church than his brother-in-law of France, but between prayers he often got drunk, while the life of Louis matched his devotions.

There was a whole section of his people who did not like the King's extreme devotion. They called him "papelard": a very significant word in use for some generations to express a growing objection to a servile temper toward the Church. Some sneeringly nicknamed him *brother Louis,* thinking him more of a friar than a king. But they were mistaken. Louis IX was every inch a king and he never feared to put a proud or corrupt prelate in his place. He was a brave soldier and Joinville writes: "I saw him four times place himself in peril of death in order to save his people." On one occasion "single handed he fought six Turks with mighty sword strokes" until his retreating men rallied to help him. Louis' friend, Joinville, had been excommunicated because of his action in the disputed election of an abbot. The King backed Joinville and was invited to meet alone a great assembly of prelates. Louis came out of the meeting "laughing and told us of the squabbles he had had with the prelates." The primate said to him, "Sire, I would not have on my conscience such a sin as you have committed for all the Kingdom of France" and the King told him he was so covetous he would do the same for much less. To the Bishop of Chartres, Louis replied that though he had done homage he was acting neither loyally nor justly to his King. One of the leading historians of the Middle Ages says that Louis IX showed greater freedom "in defending himself and his subjects from ecclesiastical domination than any French monarch had ventured to exhibit since the days of Charlemagne." (Lea.)

Louis had no pride in his mortifications nor any desire to inflict them on others. Joinville writes: "His court was carried on with open hand very *courteously* and with-

out stint; far more so than had been the case at the courts of his predecessors for some time." After the return of Louis from the crusade, he dressed with extreme plainness; always in dark blue cloth with no fur except deer or hare skins. But he gave advice which showed the same worldly wisdom as Shakespeare's Polonius in his advice to his son: "A man ought to have such dress and equipment that the graybeards of the day should not be able to say it was overdone, nor the young men that there was something wanting."

Louis had a very warm sympathy for all suffering. Wherever he went he not only gave to "churches, leper asylums, hospitals, homes for the blind, Magdalen asylums, etc., and people of gentle blood reduced to poverty, but every day he fed a multitude of poor people." (Joinville.) The best proof of his sympathy for the poor is shown in connection with the dominant trait of his life; the love of justice. No king ever had a stronger sense of his official duty to men and before God. He always kept himself accessible to his people. "I have seen him come into the garden at Paris in summer, carpets were spread for us to sit down upon around him and all those who had business stood about in front of him." "Then the King assigned each cause to some of his people to hear and settle." The provostship of Paris was by custom sold and bribery and gross injustice made the common people afraid of the provost's court. In addition Paris was filled with thieves and criminals. "The King, who was very anxious that the common people should be protected, learned the whole truth." Then he searched throughout the entire kingdom to find a magistrate "who would spare the rich man no more than the poor man" and gave him a large salary. Justice returned to the court and crime left the city. For everywhere he could, Louis IX followed the advice he gave his son: "Keep a gentle and compassionate heart toward the poor, the un-

fortunate and the afflicted and help them so far as in thee lies. . . . In administering justice to thy subjects be loyal and firm without turning to the right hand or the left. . . . Have good provosts and bailiffs and inquire frequently . . . if they are greedy, treacherous or deceitful."

St. Louis loved not only justice but peace. "No ruler in the world ever worked harder to make peace between his subjects." So great was his reputation for justice that he became a sort of standing court of arbitration among quarrelling rulers. The princes of the Empire often appealed to him to settle their differences. He went to Ghent and made peace in Flanders and Hainaut. The revolted barons of England sought from him a decision in their dispute with their King. Louis, who believed as strongly in the divine right as in the human duty of kings, naturally decided in favour of the principles of absolutism.

Only once was he obliged to put the royal banner into the field of civil war. A great noble driven by the pride and the tongue lashing of his wife, an ex-queen of England, formed a conspiracy among the higher nobles of the fiefs of the southeast and south who had been conquered by Philip Augustus. Louis mobilized two armies, but there was very little fighting, for the coalition broke to pieces by its own weight, and a chronicler writes: "From that time on the barons of France ceased to undertake anything against their King." The barons did not fear his sword, though he knew how to use it, as they had feared the sword of his grandfather, but "they feared him," as a chronicler writes, "because they knew he was just." No ambition could tempt him into a war of conquest and he was always ready when trouble arose with his neighbours, to meet them half way in compromise. He bestowed on France the inestimable blessing of nearly fifty years of peace and gave to her people an incarnation

of the ideal of the sacred person of a king; so often described in words as a doer of justice and a lover of peace.

His energy for the hard details of the business of his office never flagged. Always ready to hear advice, he did not lean weakly on favourites but formed his own shrewd judgment of men and affairs and carried them out with a powerful will. The saint had a very human temper which he usually kept under control, but sometimes it ran away with him as when, for instance, he trounced with his own hands a careless and lazy squire who had failed to follow him with his palfrey.

On one subject, that of crusading, his shrewd common sense failed him. He took the oath for the first of his crusades and caused his three brothers to take it, to the surprise and dismay of his councillors. The expedition was led unskillfully. He was taken prisoner and paid an enormous ransom. His six years' absence was bad for his realm. Of the second crusade Joinville writes: "I was of the opinion that all those committed a deadly sin who advised him to that voyage, because the entire kingdom was at peace within itself and with all its neighbours and after he left its condition has never ceased to grow worse and worse. They committed a sin to counsel the voyage in the great weakness to which his body was reduced—a weakness so great that he allowed me to carry him from the house of the Count of Auxerre where I took leave of him, to the Franciscans. And yet, weak as he was, had he remained in France he might have lived for many a year and done much good." He invaded Tunis in the summer of 1270; the army he had spent three years in preparing wasted away from heat and disease and he himself died in camp of the plague at the age of fifty-six.

The desire to kill any one who differed from the authorized teaching of the Church was so strong and universal in the middle ages, that it seems like a contagious

mania and no pious man of those times was immune from that contagion. Louis once told the story of a poor crippled knight who had knocked down with his crutch a Jew, who when asked if he believed in the virgin birth said no, and the King added to the tale: "I tell you a layman when he hears the Christian law evil spoken of should not defend that law save only with his sword; which he ought to run into the infidel's belly as far as it will go." It was quite in character therefore that Saint Louis should have sanctioned the establishment of the Papal Inquisition and backed the first inquisitor, who announced that "all France was boiling with the venom of heretical reptiles." The man was guilty of such insane cruelties that after some five years an appeal was made to the Pope and he was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. But, in spite of such warnings as this, the irresponsible foreign tribunal bound by no tradition, guided by no law, able to do anything it chose to detect or convict, went on to introduce a system of jurisprudence "which infected the criminal law of all lands subjected to its influence and rendered the administration of penal justice a mockery for centuries." (Lea.)

CHAPTER XVII

THE FRENCH PEOPLE BACK THE CROWN AGAINST BONIFACE VIII

Philip III was, like his father, pious and free from physical vices, but although he was nicknamed the Hardy, he lacked will-power and his uncle soon became the controlling influence at court. He it was who led the King into the disastrous enterprise of the crusade against Aragon in defense of Martin IV; a Frenchman who had been in the French royal council before he became Pope. The King of Aragon had helped the anti-papalists of Italy, so the Pope deposed him and offered the crown to Philip's son. Philip's father, with all his piety, would have refused such an offer, because it implied an acknowledgment of the right of a pope to depose a king and also because it entailed an unnecessary war of foreign conquest. But Philip crossed the Pyrenees as the leader of a crusade with the largest army any King of France had ever commanded. Four months later, the destruction of the fleet on which he depended for supplies, compelled his retreat. Scarcely was he across the Pyrenees when he died (1285). So ended the first war of conquest undertaken outside the natural boundaries of France and the ablest historian of Philip III can find no more characteristic summary of his reign than "it prepared the country, clergy, nobility and burghers for the heavy taxes of the times of his son Philip IV."

Philip IV (the Fair) reigned 29 years and was succeeded by his three sons, who wore the crown during fourteen years. These four kings and a posthumous son of one of them (an infant who lived only seven days) are frequently lumped together by historians under the title

of The Last Capetians of the Direct Male Line. It is well to find some general term for them because we have little reliable information about their personality. Their funeral statues executed in the same workshop after their death all seem exactly alike. Though the father lived through stirring events, it is not possible to be quite sure just what part he played in them. Whatever it was, two of the men who helped him play it were neither nobles nor clergymen but subtle jurists from the south, trained in the law schools of Montpellier and Toulouse. These two lawyers were the agents of the crown in a life and death struggle with Pope Boniface VIII, which was the most important and far-reaching event in European history, not only for the reign of Philip the Fair, but, also for a century after and before his death.

Ever since the pontificate of Gregory VII, the papacy had claimed not only supreme moral and religious authority, but a very large degree of financial and political control over the western European world. Resistance to this claim had brought about the extinction of the Imperial House of Hohenstaufen and the temporary ruin of the German Empire. In the beginning of the thirteenth century almost all the kings of the extraimperial kingdoms had acknowledged themselves vassals of Innocent III (1198–1216) who wrote: "The Lord left to Peter the government not only of the Church but of the whole world." None of the French kings had ever acknowledged that he was a vassal of the pope, but they had tacitly connived at the assumption of control over the Church in France by popes who had been willing to find for active disputes compromises which saved the face of both parties.

A general and powerful reaction against these papal claims had appeared of which France had become the protagonist and, with this temper strong in the transalpine world, the election a century after Innocent III of

Boniface VIII was a great misfortune for the papacy. Because the new Pope was haughty and violent, apt to promulgate superfluous assertions of abstract right in the tone most certain to provoke resentment. His first struggle with the King of France was in the field of finance. Boniface issued a bull which forbade all princes to levy any extraordinary taxes on clerical property without the consent of the pope. The King answered by forbidding the export of gold and silver from France, which automatically cut off the Pope's income from that country. The result was that Boniface gave way.

The quarrel was renewed not long after in the realm of law. A bishop was arrested on charges of having talked traitorously against the King. He had a hearing and was remanded to the keeping of his archbishop, who was a member of the royal council. A memoir was then sent to the Pope which added to the charge of treason the accusation that he had called the Pope an "incarnate devil" and said that St. Louis was in hell. To these charges there were no witnesses and they were perhaps invented by the King's attorney, an early type of the unscrupulous lawyer who recks not of law or justice if he can obtain conviction. The memoir asked that the Pope should degrade the accused from the episcopate in order that the King might punish "this wretch whose horrible enormities stain the very soil on which he lives." The answer of the Pope was a peremptory order to the King to allow the accused bishop to come to Rome.

But the bishop soon dropped out of sight because Pope Boniface transferred the quarrel to the sphere of abstract right. The bull "Hearken my son" asserted the supremacy of a pope over all realms and kings, accused the King of wronging the Church and announced an assembly of the French clergy to consider the peace and salvation of the kingdom. The highly rhetorical bull was parodied by one of the royal lawyers into a short docu-

ment which he who ran might read. "Boniface servant of the servants of God to Philip King of France. Fear God and keep his commandments. Learn that you are subject both in temporal and in spiritual things. The granting of church benefices and prebends belongeth in no wise to you. . . . If you have conferred some benefices we declare the transaction null and void and we revoke all that has been done in the matter. Those who believe otherwise will be considered heretics." The following pretended reply of the King to this doctored bull of the Pope was probably circulated at Paris. "Philip, by the grace of God King of France, to Boniface, who calls himself Pope, little or no greeting. Let thy supreme fatuity know that we are subject to none in temporal affairs, that appointments to vacant benefices and prebends belong to us by the right of our crown . . . that the appointments we have made, and shall make in future, are valid and that we are resolute to maintain in possession those we have appointed. Those who think otherwise are fools and madmen."

The issue was now joined between the King and the Pope on the question, who, in the last analysis, was supreme in France in political affairs, and Philip the Fair wished to know how his kingdom stood. Since the time of the King's grandfather assemblies more or less numerous had not infrequently been called to advise or help the crown in special emergencies. Philip now called one to meet in the Cathedral of Notre Dame at Paris in April, 1302. It was the largest and the most notable of these assemblies and it has sometimes been mistakenly called the first Estates General of France. The gathering voted in three houses; clergy, nobles, and burghers. The last two sent letters to the college of cardinals backing the King. The clergy wrote less openly, but their intent to stand by the King may be read between the lines. The answer of the Pope was the bull *Unam Sanctam*, which

claimed supreme power in things temporal as well as in things spiritual and declared faith in that supreme unlimited power necessary to salvation. This was a step beyond anything done by any previous pope in regard to the claim of power in finances and politics.

After some hesitation the King answered this assertion by an attack on the Pope in the realm of canon law. He was accused before an assembly of prelates and nobles, of denying the immortality of the soul by saying: "I would sooner be a dog than a Frenchman." He was charged also with "simony, blasphemy and terrible vices." The assembly of a general council of the Church was demanded in order to depose the Pope. This demand was sent throughout the kingdom and signed, probably not without the threat of force in some places, by most of the higher clergy. Some half a dozen monasteries alone refused. The nobility, the University of Paris and assemblages of burghers in many cities, assented by acclamation. The Pope excommunicated the King and declared that any subjects who obeyed him were anathema. The King's trusted legal expert went secretly to Italy and assembled near Anagni, where the Pope was, mercenaries and the troops of some Italian lords and nobles hostile to Boniface. Bursting suddenly into Anagni, he arrested the Pope and told him he must appear before a general council for trial. The aged man remained in the hands of his enemies for three days. But they could not take him to Lyons as they had intended and, menaced by a rising of the citizens and the arrival of knights from Rome, they were obliged to withdraw. The Pope went to Rome where, within a month, he died.

His successor was a learned Dominican, gentle and inclined to compromise, who revoked at once all the anathemas against Philip and his realm and died six months after election. During the year which followed his death, a struggle went on between the French sympathizers in

the college of cardinals and the friends of Boniface; mainly Italians. The result was a complete victory for Philip in the election of the Archbishop of Bordeaux. We do not need to accept legends whose details are demonstrably false, to believe that his election was the result of some sort of a bargain. At all events the new Pope called the cardinals across the Alps to Lyons for his coronation and, for seventy years, the Papacy abandoned the Tiber for the banks of the Rhone. Within a month of becoming Pope he appointed nine French cardinals; the beginning of a process which at one time gave the French party twenty-five out of twenty-eight votes in the conclave of the cardinals.

In this completely victorious resistance to the claim of the Papacy to be supreme in finance and politics as well as in religion and morals, Philip was expressing a feeling widespread elsewhere than in France, but he was not fighting for the general cause of liberty or reform. He was interested in the royal authority and especially in the income of the crown.

He was always in need of money. This led him to debase the coinage which brought enormous immediate gains to the crown and according to a commission of notables "the death and destruction of commerce." But although he was the first to do this, he was by no means the last. For more than three hundred years kings of France and many other kings used intermittently this easy but disastrous aid to the treasury of a state.

The same need and the same greed led Philip IV to several acts of great cruelty and injustice. On a given day in July 1306, the Jews all over France were arrested and their property and account books seized. Their property was sold for the benefit of the King and the crown became the creditor of all their Christian debtors. The despoiled people were banished from the realm. The Lombards, that is the North Italian bankers who had set-

tled in France in considerable numbers, were hated little less than the Jews by those who borrowed of them. They were suddenly banished to the profit of their debtors and the crown.

But the most cruel and unjust outcome of Philip the Handsome's need of money, was the destruction of the military monastic Order of the Temple. Founded after the first crusade to defend pilgrims to the Holy Land, it had become by the beginning of the fourteenth century extremely wealthy and, in their castles in France, England, Aragon, Portugal and Germany, the Templars not only directed the cultivation of their great estates, but acted as bankers; receiving money for safe keeping and loaning it. They had become unpopular and were accused of pride, avarice and hard drinking. On the 13th of October 1307, all the Templars of France were arrested by royal officers in the name of the Inquisition. The only proofs of the charges of heresy and immorality were confessions obtained by torture so severe that, in Paris alone, twenty-five died under it. Many of the victims retracted their confessions, but the tendency to do this was checked when the Archbishop of Sens burned fifty-four retractors at once outside of the Porte St. Antoine of Paris as relapsed heretics. So the Temple was suppressed by the Pope and an enormous amount of its property came into the hands of the King. Seven years after their first arrest the Grand Master and the *Precepteur* of Normandy were brought out of prison to the portal of Notre Dame to hear their sentence of perpetual imprisonment. They denied all crimes except that they had basely accused and betrayed the Order to save their lives. That same night they were burnt at the stake with the consent of the King.

None of the Italian writers of the day, and they could safely express their opinion, believed that the Templars were guilty, and popular belief in their innocence finally

took the form of the legend that the Grand Master, as the pyre was lighted, summoned Pope and King to meet him within a year before the judgment seat of God. The facts as we know them are summarized by the most modern historian of the inquisition. "Pope Clement V died at Carpentras in April 1314, carrying with him the shame and guilt of the ruin of the Templars and was followed in about seven months by his tempter and accomplice, Philip the Fair."

Philip IV and his sons had to deal with no open revolt in the main body of their realm. But there were two royal fiefs which they could not reduce beneath their authority; in the south Guienne, whose duke was King of England; in the north Flanders, whose count did homage both to the King of France and to the Emperor of Germany.

The people of the great commercial cities of Flanders were at this time engaged in strife within their own walls. When they began to grow wealthy, merchants had constituted the first municipal governments. Their courage and skill had obtained charters which guaranteed liberty; they had organized the finances, the militia and the whole system of administration. In the hands of their descendants the political power had rested for generations. But, by the middle of the thirteenth century, the workmen who made the cloth the rich merchants exported, began to demand a voice in the government. In 1280 a democratic revolution broke out in nearly all the cities of Flanders against the oligarchies of the patricians. The Count of Flanders interfered on the side of the common people; though not because of any liking for democracy. The patricians then turned for help to the count's overlord the King of France which gained for them the contemptuous name of the *Leliærts* or *lilyites.*

In 1300 Philip the Fair made peace with England and, having isolated Flanders, rapidly occupied by his troops the whole country. The old count and his eldest

son surrendered and were sent prisoners to Paris. The Queen's uncle was named viceroy and the King made a stately visit to the chief towns. It was practically the annexation of Flanders to the royal domain and the fulfilment of the hope of his great-great-grandfather Philip Augustus that France would "one day absorb Flanders."

But Flanders was easier to conquer than to keep. The royal governor was a proud and rash feudalist without any sympathy for burghers. The people of Bruges massacred one night most of the French soldiers they had within their walls and war began again. Under the joint lead of a little one-eyed weaver and the grandson of the deposed count, the men of the cloth factories, armed with stout pikes or heavy clubs and helmets, rallied to the fight. There were not over thirty mounted men among them as they stood at bay near the walls of Courtrai (1302). When the chivalry of France led by the King's brother drew near, the Flemings formed into a solid mass and waited the attack. Without any attempt to use his crossbow men, expecting to trample down these worthless footmen, the French leader launched his knights across swampy land cut by ditches. The result was a fearful massacre of the French followed by their flight in desperate panic. The Flemings took no prisoners and they hung hundreds of the gilded spurs of slain seigneurs on the walls of the cathedral of Courtrai, fallen as the knightly chronicler laments "by the hands of villeins." An intermittent struggle of twenty years followed, at the end of which Flanders, abandoning her Walloon territories for a time, became a territory entirely German, but escaped for ever the danger—or the opportunity—of being absorbed into France.

CHAPTER XVIII

A CENTURY OF DEVELOPMENT IN GOVERNMENT AND LITERATURE

During the century we are considering, there was a steady development of an organization for governing the kingdom. The principle of division of labour was applied to the working of the royal court, organs for finance, for law, for politics and diplomacy were evolved, and a bureaucracy trained for carrying on the work of government was formed. This was not only concentrated at court but scattered throughout the realm. The bailiffs, formerly men sent on missions, became appointees of the King fixed in their bailiwicks; wielding as local officers of justice and finance, police and military power. It was the silent pressure of these officers, representatives of the king, which developed that great arbitrary power of the crown, which, to foreign observers two centuries later, was the most remarkable thing in the French state. The political service of the king was severed from his personal service which became complicated beyond belief.

But it was not the expense of this small army of servitors who had to be fed and more or less finely clothed which made the king need money. In peace he could balance his budget. It was war that made Philip the Fair a heavy taxer. He invented no new impositions but he extended and sharpened old expedients. From the beginning of the thirteenth century on, the king had the right, not only to military service from seigneurs, his vassals, but from all faithful subjects. This was gradually commuted for a money payment and so grew into a tax which could be applied by the king "in case of necessity." The king also asked loans from rich burghers of his

loyal cities and these requests were rather hard to refuse. For example, here is the end of one royal letter: " . . . So we ask you by the love and fealty which you bear toward us and if you wish to avoid our displeasure, to aid us in these circumstances by a loan of 300 *livres*. Send that sum to our people at the Louvre without excuse or delay, for we know certainly that you can well do it either by yourself or with your friends . . . and we wish you clearly to understand that we will never consider any man a faithful friend who fails us in such great need."

French literature for a century after the death of Philip Augustus does not contain many very notable works. Nor did it, in spite of the fact that French continued to be spoken by large numbers of people to whom it was not a native tongue, exercise upon outside countries anything like the influence of the literature of the previous period.

Philip de Remi, Seigneur de Beaumanoir, was born about 1250. After travelling to England he entered into the royal service and became successively bailiff, or seneschal, in five different bailiwicks. He wrote in excellent French prose a treatise on the general principles of French law. He wrote also romances in verse; of which the most notable is entitled *Jean and Blonde*. It is a very commonplace story, which illustrates the opinion with which the poem opens; that a poor young gentleman ought to find something better to do than to stay at home and be an expense to his parents. Jean's father is Lord of Dammartin, a little fief heavily mortgaged as the result of too many tourneys in the old man's youth. So Jean, mounted on a good horse with twenty livres in his pocket and with his faithful valet Robin, starts for England. There he is taken into the household of the Count of Oxford and falls in love with his master's daughter Blonde. He has a series of decidedly commonplace experiences, inheriting his father's fief, launching his three brothers in royal favour, running away with Blonde,

fighting his rival, the Count of Gloucester, by moonlight on the sands at Dover (the only romantic touch), a big wedding feast given by his sisters at Dammartin, placating his father-in-law with the help of the King and becoming a knight. He makes good marriages for all his brothers and sisters and does not forget to find daughters of burghers for the faithful Robin and the sailor who had helped him in the fight on Dover sands—and they all lived happily ever afterwards.

Baudouin de Sebourc appeared anonymously some thirty years later. It is an enormous narrative poem, half heroic, half comic, a sort of parody on the old *epopées* descended from the *Chansons de Geste*. Its hero is the son of a king sold by a traitor to the Saracens during the crusades. The traitor marries the Queen who soon becomes alarmed for the safety of her youngest son Baudouin, hated by his stepfather. So she commits him to the care of the Seigneur de Sebourc, who brings him up as if he were his own son. Before he had a beard he inspired such jealousy among husbands that any woman to whom he was seen talking was well beaten as soon as she got home. At his first tournament he gained twenty horses whose riders he had knocked from the saddle. He seduces the daughter of his foster-father but refuses to marry her and runs away with the Lady of Flanders. They flee to France, where they spend all their money and Baudouin takes service as a mercenary soldier and performs prodigies of valour. He has various comic encounters with rascally priests, innkeepers, city police, etc., and they finally reach the east where "they have absurd and monstrous adventures which occupy fourteen years and several thousand couplets." He comes back home, challenges the traitor, kills him and recovers his rank. The huge poem has a certain verve in its coarse fibred humour and, like *Jean and Blonde,* it is full of little pictures of the manners of the days in which it was written, which appeal to

the curiosity of a modern reader and give the romantic feeling inspired by a successful masquerade. But it seems strange, that contemporary readers, who lacked this seasoning, did not find the long drawn out tales insipid.

These two works would indicate plainly, even if there were no other evidence, that the words of the historian of German court life in the days of chivalry apply also in large part to France, though to a less degree. "In the second half of the thirteenth century the decline of knightly and noble society is clearly discernible. Of the refined manners of *courtoisie* only luxurious tastes survived. As money to gratify those tastes began to fail, knights looked with envious and malign eyes on the growing wealth of the burghers and took to open robbery (in France the king prevented this) to get the luxuries they now looked on as necessities for a gentleman. The burgher class wins more and more importance. From the fourteenth century on it is the carrier of national culture and out of its midst rose the artists who worked for it and represent its tastes." The change was neither sudden nor complete. Old forms like the tournament, shorn of much of its danger, survived. The legend of King Arthur was rewritten in English nearly one hundred and fifty years after our period, but the age of chivalry was over.

One thing belonging to the social and intellectual life of France did change completely and abruptly at the time when the house of Capet died out (1328). A brilliant modern critic writes: "At this date when the fabliaux disappear, all the literary forms of the previous century perish or are changed. We find no more heroic epics, or poems of adventure or the Round Table, but vast romantic compositions in prose—no more stories of Reynard the Fox but grave moral aphorisms. Old lyric styles, *Chansons d'Amour, pastourelles*, etc., no longer appear and their place is taken by poems with a technique steadily becoming more and more complicated, not intended to

be sung but to be read, *virelais, rondeaux, ballades, chants royaux*. A distinct period of our literary history is closed." The age of the minstrel is over and he is replaced by the man of letters highly conscious of his individuality and following a reflective fashion in his art.

In one part of her spiritual life France still kept, at the end of the thirteenth century, that dominant influence which she had exercised generally upon the western European world during the twelfth century. The University of Paris was still the chief centre of the world of learning. As a contemporary said, France was the "oven in which the intellectual bread of the whole world was baked." This position was maintained in spite of internecine strife between the ordinary professors of theology and those who belonged to the two great learned begging orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic—a strife which became so desperate about the middle of the thirteenth century that the King had to send guards to protect the monasteries.

Even the strongest objectors to the independence of University rules shown by the monks who lectured on theology around Mount Sainte Genevieve, must have admitted that they played large parts in maintaining the world wide fame of Paris and making it the leading centre of learning for Europe. It was the English Franciscan, Alexander of Hales (died 1245), who began the task of reconciling Aristotle, considered the supreme authority in science and philosophy, with the Bible, as interpreted by the current theology. Two Dominicans, Albert the Great (died 1280) a German, and his pupil, Thomas Aquinas, a Neapolitan (died 1274) finished the work: adapting the faith to its strange associate by subtle logic where it was not too much of a strain and throwing overboard any part of Aristotle which could not be brought into anything but open contradiction with the doctrine of the Church. The reconciling and amalgamating work of

Aquinas was strongly attacked from both sides, but he has become the classic theologian of the Roman Catholic Church and the final authoritative interpreter by dialectic of her belief.

In the two most characteristic literary works of this period the atmosphere of learning has oppressed the imagination. The *Romance of the Rose* in its first form, written during the early years of the reign of Saint Louis, is worthy of its name. It is an "art of love" written for a high born public in the *courtois* style. After the death of Louis, a wealthy burgher, master of arts of Paris and translator of various Latin works, borrowed the title for a poem which was little more than a very free spoken expression of his opinion on all sorts of subjects, ranging from philosophy and theology to woman. He attacks the new religious orders, kings, the celibacy of the clergy, the power of the nobility, etc. *The Imitation Reynard* was written between 1322 and 1330 by a grocer of Troyes. In this new treatment of an old theme, the adventures of the clever fox become nothing but a cord on which to string the author's observations on history, medicine and the seven liberal arts. The fox himself is always quoting learned writers and talks very freely about the origins of royal power, the causes of inequality among men and above all the wrongs done by the nobility to the rest of society.

In their learning, their readiness to criticize society and the state, the freedom of their discussions and their democratic tinge, these two University educated burghers are followed by most of the writers between the death of Philip Augustus and the accession of Philip of Valois (1223–1328). This attitude of the burgher writers of the century is even more plainly shown in the *Book of the Secrets of Philosophers,* which is a very bold discussion of the political, social and religious organization of the world. It says that a great hunter named Nimrod in-

vented chivalry and based it by force on taxes; against the natural right by which all things which come out of the earth are common to all men. Hence arose empires, kingdoms, duchies, etc., and the "little people are taxed, plundered and devoured." The public evidently liked bold discussions of social topics. Their appetite for information is shown by the appearance of a number of encyclopædias or manuals in French, such as *The Image of the World* (1245); the *Fountain of All Sciences* (1240) or *The Treasure of Brunetto Latini* (1265).

PERIOD 6

THE GREAT MISERY—THE TRIUMPH OF THE CROWN (1328–1483)

A. The 100 Years War to the Peace of Brétigny (1360). Etienne Marcel. The Jacquerie.

B. Kings Wise and Foolish. Joan of Arc.

C. The Great Misery. French Courage. The Babylonian Captivity. Gallicanism. The Nobility of the Robe.

D. Art and Letters Survive Misery.

E. Louis XI. Extends and Consolidates the Kingdom (1461–1483).

Chapters XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII.

CHAPTER XIX

THE HUNDRED YEARS WAR. ETIENNE MARCEL, THE CHAMPION OF URBAN LIBERTY

The thirteenth century and the first quarter of the fourteenth was a time of prosperity for the French people. During those four generations peace was rather rarely and never very profoundly disturbed by war. The nobles had crossed the swamps of the Netherlands and the passes of the Pyrenees to fight in Flanders or Spain, but the mass of the people, undisturbed on their farms or in their workshops, had paid the bills without too much strain. During this interval of comparative tranquillity the French people made the first notable display of that power to repair rapidly the wastes of war by industry and frugality which has remained for centuries one of their outstanding characteristics. With peace and plenty the population had increased until the realm probably counted something over twenty million inhabitants, or about half the population of modern France, which lives on a considerably larger territory. This population was much more evenly distributed than the population is now, but Paris with about three hundred thousand inhabitants, was the largest city in the world and seven or eight times as large as London. Rouen was almost as large as Paris.

In contrast to the period from 1200 to 1328, the four generations from the coronation of Philip VI (Valois) to the expulsion of the English from France (1328–1453) was a period of intermittent disaster, misery and anarchy, whose burden fell with crushing weight on the peasant and burgher. During this age of suffering and decadence, the only thoroughly prosperous calling was that of

the mercenary soldier who had no difficulty in finding jobs at high wages.

The cause of this misery was what is known as the Hundred Years War with England. This struggle was not continuous for a hundred years—if it had been France might have perished—but, counting out intervals of truce or peace, the hostilities occupied a hundred years. It was not really to the interest of either nation to fight. Indeed a wise man may doubt whether any war is ever, in the long run, to the interest of any nation, unless it be defense against people who hope to get a living by plundering their neighbours who are willing to work for it. But the Hundred Years War, really a war of jealous dynasties, was very much more of a national war on the English than on the French side. For the astonishing victory of three million Englishmen over twenty million Frenchmen was, in the last analysis, not due to their better disciplined army; nor to the fact that three wearers of the English crown were skilful generals able to develop a new tactical technique to oppose "those absurd perversions of the art of war more omnipotent in France than any other country of Europe, which covered themselves under the name of chivalry." It was due to the fact that many Frenchmen fought against their own King in alliance with the English. Gauls helped Cæsar to conquer Gaul and without the help of Frenchmen the English could never have conquered France.

The ostensible cause of the war was the claim of Edward III King of England, to be the rightful King of France. So indeed he was according to English customs of inheritance, for the direct male line of Hugh Capet was extinct, Edward's mother was the only daughter of Philip the Fair, and Edward was nephew of the last three kings of France. But the French barons held that a woman could neither inherit the throne nor transmit the right of inheritance. So Philip of Valois, son of the second son

of Philip the Hardy, was crowned King of France. The claim to the French throne was therefore a dispute between two families which had intermarried twice in three generations. Although Edward assumed the title of King of France, it is probable that his serious reasons for war were three. He feared the destruction of the English wool trade with Flanders. He complained of violations of his rights as vassal Duke of Guienne. He had conquered Scotland and he knew there was a secret alliance between the fugitive Scottish King and the French King. Not long after the beginning of the war the English King found two allies in France.

Under the lead of a rich merchant, Jacob van Artevelde, the population of the great manufacturing city of Ghent had risen against their Count and against their King. Their chief object in this rebellion was to obtain from the King of England the wool for their looms which he had cut off by an embargo. When van Artevelde obtained the lifting of the embargo, all Flanders rallied to him. In January 1340 Edward received in Ghent the oath of allegiance of the three chief cities of Flanders made to him as the legitimate heir of the crown of St. Louis. In reply he swore upon the bible to maintain their rights and their independence. Edward found help also in Brittany, where a disputed succession to the title of duke had been decided by Philip. The unsuccessful contestant joined Edward for twenty years of civil war. The English King already had two gateways into France, his own duchy of Guienne in the south and Flanders in the north. This gave him a third gateway in the middle and he was easily able to keep the war on the enemies' territory.

He stopped the danger of a counter invasion of England by a single naval battle which gave him command of the sea. In 1340 the French fleet was anchored off the coast of Flanders. It consisted of about two hundred

ships carrying over twenty thousand men; Normans and Genoese. The two hundred and fifty ships of the English fleet carried besides seamen four thousand mailed men at arms and eleven thousand archers. It was led to the attack by Edward himself in a great ship whose banners showed the arms of England and France. The battle was fought with bow and sword and lasted all day and into the night. The English lost ten thousand men. But only thirty ships of the French escaped and for several days the Flemish coast was strewn with their corpses cast up by the tide.

The war on land was lingering and neither side seemed anxious to put it to the touch. It was nine years after Edward's defiance of Philip before the two kings met at the head of armies the age thought great.

In July 1346 Edward III landed in Normandy and for a month ravaged and plundered the country. He then pushed up the Seine toward Paris, burning and laying waste. But, hearing that the French had mustered a hundred thousand men at St. Denis, he determined to retire toward his allies in Flanders. His rapid retreat was barred after four days by the boggy banks and deep current of the river Somme, and he knew the French army was at his heels. His scouts brought back word that the bridges were broken, the good fords held by strong contingents and a passage impossible except by a ford at the head of tidewater and so usable only twice a day. A bad strategist, Edward was an able tactician and at his best in trouble. He made for the risky ford, drove off with the help of his archers the French force which guarded it, and finished his passage just as the tide and the French army arrived together. His retreat to Flanders was secure and he determined to pick his ground and stand for battle.

He and his father and grandfather had learned something from victory and defeat in fighting the Scotch and

Welsh, which continental generals did not know. He really had new tactics. In addition, his army, though not much more than a quarter of the French, was a picked force and thoroughly disciplined. Still further, he had a new missile weapon, the longbow, and more than half of his twenty thousand men were armed with it.

The division of the army was the stock one in mediæval war, into three battles. Eight thousand men under the Crown Prince held the right of the line, four thousand held the left and the King himself commanded the reserve of eight thousand men. The centre of each of the first two battles was held by a body of twelve hundred dismounted men-at-arms, in full armour, probably six or eight ranks deep, on each side of which there was placed a force of archers and Welsh light-armed footmen. The French, some sixty thousand strong, advancing in a straggling march, did not know of the English array until their vanguard was only a mile from it. The King at once sent orders to the vanguard to retire and to the troops behind him to halt. But the different lords in command of contingents only half obeyed. With that childish jealousy and recklessness, which under the mask of chivalry had taken the place of courage, each wanted to be first in the field. A contemporary chronicler gives a vivid picture of the fight.

"Those from behind kept pressing up, saying they were as good men as the vanguard and would get as far forward as they" and a great disorderly mass of horsemen rolled on toward the Englishmen ranked in flexible articulated line waiting for them. "The earls, barons, and Lords of France advanced one after the other without order, in any way most pleasing to themselves." Even the King, swept on with this stream of horsemen, lost his hold on himself when he came in sight of the English. "His blood began to boil and he cried out to his marshals: 'Order the Genoese forward and begin the battle in the name

of God and St. Denis.'" The Genoese mercenary crossbowmen, at least six thousand in number, got through the press and into some sort of line. "Then they made a great leap and cry to abash the Englishmen, but they stood still and stirred not for all that. Then the Genoese again a second time made another leap and a fell cry and stepped forward a little, but the Englishmen stirred not one foot; thirdly again they leaped and cried and went forth until they came within shot. Then they shot fiercely with their crossbows." We know from English sources that their bolts slew hardly a man, but fell short a few yards from the lines of the longbowmen. "Then the English archers stepped forward one pace and let fly their arrows so hotly and so thick that it seemed snow. When the Genoese felt the arrows piercing through heads, arms and breasts many of them cast down their crossbows and returned discomfitted. When the French King saw them fly away, he said: 'Slay these rascals.' Then you should have seen the men at arms dash in among them and kill a great number of them and ever still the Englishmen shot where they saw the press was thickest. The sharp arrows ran into the men at arms and into their horses and many fell, horse and man, among the Genoese and when they were down they could not form line again for the press was so thick that one overthrew another. And also among the Englishmen there were certain rascals that went afoot with great knives. And they went in among the men-at-arms and slew and murdered many as they lay on the ground both earls, barons, knights and squires." Into and through this press crashed a second French charge only to fall like the first under the English arrows. Again and again long after dusk—at least fifteen times—bodies of the recklessly brave French rushed forward, but the English men-at-arms stood firm against the shattered charges which reached their lines. No French leader seems to have had intelligence or control enough to turn the charge against the archers.

So the bull-headed struggle wore itself out against the lines of Edward, who never put on his helmet that day, but coolly watched from a windmill in the rear two thirds of his little army slaughter the helpless chivalry of France. Froissart writes, after listening to many men who had fought at Crécy: "No man unless he had been present can imagine the confusion of that day and the bad management and disorder of the French." The total English loss was two knights, one squire, some forty men-at-arms and archers and less than a hundred Welsh. The loss of the French was fifteen hundred barons and knights and from ten to twenty thousand not of noble blood. The capture of Calais, which the English were to hold for more than two centuries, followed this sweeping defeat.

Ten years later at Poitiers the Black Prince, the son of Edward III, with about ten thousand men, won a somewhat similar victory against a French army four or five times as large, commanded by King John II, son of his father's adversary at Crécy. King John indeed stood to it and fought it out, until, ringed in by the victors, he was taken prisoner; together with his younger son and more than two thousand nobles. John was carried to England, where he received every honourable courtesy suggested by the rules of chivalry. Four years later (1360) he returned to France to sign the treaty which English historians call the Treaty of Brétigny and the French the Treaty of Calais. In it Edward renounced all pretensions to the crown of France and John ceded to him extensive territories in the southeast of France and also the town of Calais. These were to be held, not as a vassal, but as a sovereign prince. Edward renounced his alliance with Flanders and John his alliance with the Scotch. In addition John agreed to pay an enormous ransom. He remained only three years in France and finding that he could not make payments on his ransom according to agreement, returned like a loyal chevalier, to England,

where, three months later, he died. He was a weak and inefficient king, frivolous and incurably extravagant in times of misery for the people. His nickname, the Good, does not refer to his religion or his morals. It was given in the sense of the good fellow—the open-handed, generous, high liver who gathered his knights around him for banquet and tourney and ball.

Fortunately for France, John's son Charles V earned his nickname of the Wise and he gave France a breathing spell between the miserable years of the reign of his father and grandfather and the forty-two even more miserable years of the reign of his crazy son Charles VI.

Charles V inherited great problems. The first of these came to him when, a young man of nineteen, he took the government in the name of his captured father. There was a party among the burghers of Paris who wished to obtain for the burghers of the realm a larger share in the government. The head of this party was Etienne Marcel, provost of the merchants: an office which gave him considerable police power and made him a sort of supreme director of everything in the city connected with commerce. He has left no account of his own intentions and we know of him largely from the statements of men who hated him and the class from which he sprung. But lovers of the ideal of liberty under constitutional government must feel that he deserves his statue on the banks of the Seine before the city hall, for, at least, he made an effort to defend the liberties of the city of Paris against the exactions of absolute kings.

He first appears in history as the orator of the Third Estate in an assembly convoked at Paris, a few months before the battle of Poitiers, because the King needed help in raising money. The assembly voted the money the King needed on condition of certain reforms in the government. When they reassembled at the call of the heir-apparent their membership was more than eight hundred,

and this was only for two of the orders, because most of the representatives of the nobles were dead on the field of Poitiers or prisoners at Bordeaux. The anger of the burghers was very outspoken against the nobles some of whom had made such a poor showing at their own business of fighting. Chevaliers, it was said, had fled in ignoble panic or surrendered their swords without a stroke. The Estates elected eight commissioners who asked to talk in secret with the Dauphin (this was the name given to the heir-apparent). They told him the King had been surrounded since the beginning of his reign by bad men and poor councillors. They asked that these royal councillors should be brought before judges and that every one found guilty of oppression or malversation should be punished. Men representing the Estates should be sent through all the provinces to stop peculation. In addition a standing committee of twenty-eight, four clergymen, twelve chevaliers and twelve burghers, should be always around the Dauphin, who could do nothing except by their consent. After considerable hesitation the Dauphin, on the advice of the royal council, refused and the Estates dissolved leaving nothing settled. But the Dauphin with an empty treasury fell more and more under the control of Etienne Marcel and a new assembly of the Estates compelled him to accept the demands of the previous assembly. This new government of the committee of the Estates could not, however, cure the abuses against which they had protested. Jealousy arose between Paris and other cities and the nobles and clergy withdrew, leaving the committee only twelve members, all burghers.

Then the Dauphin began to show signs of breaking from the tutelage of the liberal party of Paris. Etienne Marcel gathered three thousand artisans under arms and the assembly decided the death of two marshals who were warm supporters of the Dauphin. Then with Marcel at their head, they marched towards the palace. On the

way they met a former king's advocate, and hacked him to death in a pastry cook's shop whither he fled from their fury. Arrived at the palace, one of the marshals was killed at the feet of his master whose robe was spattered with blood. The other, fleeing from room to room, was finally overtaken and killed. The Dauphin, who had not a high reputation for personal courage, begged Etienne Marcel to save him. Marcel told him he was in no danger, took himself the Dauphin's cap and put on the Dauphin's head the red and blue cap of the liberal party of the burghers of Paris. The two corpses were dragged into the court of the palace before the marble entrance of honour and for hours no man dared to touch them.

The Dauphin, who had now assumed the title of Regent, left Paris and, with the help of a badly attended assembly of the Estates, began to raise an army.

Marcel took money from the treasure of Notre Dame, borrowed from rich burghers, repaired the walls, seized the royal train of artillery and prepared for civil war. Outside of Paris, he sought allies among a class which had not been represented at all in the Estates, but whose sufferings were perhaps greater than those of any other part of the population of France. The peasants, who lived in the open country and in unfortified villages, were victims, not only of all the horrors of war, but they suffered also the exactions of their lords, whose lands they tilled, and the plundering of undisciplined soldiers. For all this misery, which kept them close to starvation, they held responsible the nobles who, they said, ran from the stricken field but were forward in pillage and extortion. So in the spring of 1358 an insurrection broke out among the peasants which spread like wildfire until it covered a large part of northern France. The insurgents carried banners with the fleurs de lis to show that they were rising against the nobles and not against the King. They were called the Jacques, from Jacques Bonhomme, the

common nickname for a rustic—like Robin Goodfellow in England. In every direction the small châteaux and manor houses were plundered and burnt. They robbed the orchards, took the carp from the fish ponds, drank the wine in the cellars, but, on the whole, they were chary of shedding blood. The chroniclers have vaguely described this revolt of the villains, whom they despised and hated, as barbarously cruel, but we know of only about thirty they put to death.

Etienne Marcel at first disapproved of the Jacquerie, which was most violent in the first outbreak. But, searching for allies, he roused the peasants around Paris to destroy the houses of some of the King's evil councillors, and, at the request of the leader of the Jacques, sent three hundred men-at-arms to co-operate for a while with him. But the Jacques had no fighting power such as was given to the English peasant by his skill with the longbow. The King of Navarre, a troublesome member of the royal family, assembled one thousand men at arms and brought the main body of the Jacques six thousand strong to bay. Although he was proud of being addressed by his friends as "the first gentleman of his day," he did not scruple to invite the leader of the peasants to an interview and then treacherously to make him prisoner. Attacking the leaderless peasants, he cut them to pieces. A fearful punishment followed. The chroniclers agree, and most of them proudly, that twenty thousand victims perished in the revenge of the nobles.

Etienne Marcel also sought aid from the great cities of Flanders to whom he wrote: "You have heard probably that a great number of nobles have been murdering and robbing in the valleys of the Somme and the Oise without making any distinction between the innocent and the guilty, the good and the bad. Although to many of these nobles no wrong had been done, nevertheless they have burnt towns, killed the good people without any mercy

whatever, pillaged everything they could lay their hands on, cruelly tortured women, children, priests and monks, put no check on their stealing and wanton killing; in short done more evil deeds more cruelly and more inhumanly than the Vandals or the Saracens ever did." But his was the only strong voice raised in pity for the poor and ignorant peasants; beasts of the field crushed by burdens almost too heavy to be borne.

For lack of a better ally, Marcel let into the city the King of Navarre. At a meeting in front of the city hall he was appointed Captain General and he swore "to live and die with the burghers of Paris against all comers." Two weeks later the Regent with thirty thousand mounted men invested Paris. Marcel wrote the communes of Flanders: "We will hazard our lives and estates to defend the honour of the good city of Paris and we who have always been free will fight that we may not fall into slavery, in which rather we wish to place these gentlemen—more villain than gentle—and we will die before we suffer them to reduce us to slavery." This appeal for help against the common enemy of all "good people, the good labourers and the good merchants" received no answer.

In despair Marcel brought into the city some bands of English mercenaries. But the people rose against them and, in the fight, six hundred Parisians fell. The King of Navarre and Marcel were glad to get the last of the English troops out of the city. What the restless and treacherous King of Navarre was plotting behind Marcel's back, is not known; perhaps he intended to proclaim himself King of France. Marcel's work was done. The thirty-first of July, 1358, while he was making a tour of the fortifications he was set upon and slain, calling out before he fell: "Why do you harm me? I have acted in your interest. You made me swear to defend the laws of the Three Estates." Thus three years after he came

into prominence as the orator to voice the complaints of the burghers of France north of the Garonne, he fell at the hands of the secret royalist party among the burghers of Paris.

CHAPTER XX

KINGS WISE AND FOOLISH. JOAN OF ARC

Charles V, surnamed The Wise, inherited in 1364 a peace with England under terms he thought intolerable, and soon after his accession he began preparations to renew the war. He reorganized the army, systematizing the change from feudal forces to paid soldiers. The backbone of his army were the royal *gens d'armes* under the command of feudal nobles in the royal pay. From the cities came corps of crossbowmen, supplemented by foreign mercenaries, Germans, Genoese, Spaniards, Welsh, and Scotch. At the battle of Crécy the cannon of the English made a great noise but did little harm. The usefulness of guns in sieges was, however, rapidly demonstrated and, thirty years later, the French army had thirty-six pieces of artillery. These forces were commanded by a military hierarchy, the Lieutenant of the King, usually a prince of the blood royal, the Constable, and the marshals. He also created a navy of thirty-five ships of the line, and eighty-five smaller vessels.

Nine years after the signature of the treaty of Calais, Charles V was ready and summoned English Edward, the Black Prince, Duke of Guienne, to answer at Paris the complaints of several counts and seigneurs of his duchy. This was, of course, to reassert the sovereignty of France, and Edward answered that, if he came, he would come helmet on head and sixty thousand men at his back.

With the approval of a council of nobles, clergy, and burghers of Paris, the King summoned Bertrand du Guesclin, a country gentleman of small estate who had won a great reputation as a soldier. When he arrived at

Paris the King told him he was to be constable. Bertrand replied: "Dear lord and noble king . . . I am too poor a man and of too humble descent for the grand and noble office of constable. Now Sire, here are my lords, your brothers, your nephews and your cousins who will have commands in your armies and how shall I dare order them?" But the King would take no excuse and, for the first time in years the army of France had a competent commander. Charles V was no soldier, but that did no harm because he knew it. The new constable developed a new strategy, a Fabian policy which refused all general battles and let the superior English armies wear themselves out by long marches while he took the scattered castles of their adherents or cut off their detached bodies. In six years this strategy had reduced the English to the seaports Calais, Cherbourg, Brest, Bayonne, and Bordeaux. Du Guesclin died two months before the royal master he served so well and was buried at the side of his tomb in St. Denis.

Charles V had the eye of a king to pick good servants and he confirmed his choice of men by councils because he was much more inclined than his father or grandfather to act after taking advice. He found his helpers among all classes, from the highest nobility to the smallest burghers. They were probably less corrupt and certainly far more efficient than any set of men who, during the previous fifty years, had administered the government of France.

Charles V did more than choose strong administrators, he reorganized the administration. For example, an elaborate royal *ordonnance* arranged for a service to conserve and exploit the forests. Six master foresters, amply paid, had under them a graded force which carried out minute precautions in regard to cutting, sale, and replanting. Great royal *ordonnances*, of which the leading ideas were manifestly taken from the complaints

and demands of the assemblies of the Estates at the time of Etienne Marcel, reformed abuses. One of the most useful of these reforms was the abolition of the *droit de prise*. Originally this was the right of the officers of the royal family when it was travelling to take what was needed. It had gradually been abusively extended until it was claimed by all the officers of the king. This right was now restricted to the king and his family and even the royal stewards must pay cash. All subjects were authorized to resist by force any other use of the *droit de prise*. The ancient hunting rights of the nobles, which bred game harmful to crops, were also restricted and the peasants were explicitly granted the right to resist infringements by using force.

Charles V also suspended the intermittent debasement of the coinage practiced by his father and grandfather and succeeded in keeping the money stable during the sixteen years of his reign. What Charles did not do to improve the financial condition of his realm was to cut down the royal expenses. He loved splendour and was a great spendthrift. Not content with the Louvre, he built a magnificent new palace. The congeries of connected buildings had no architectural beauty but it was enormous and richly decorated. Its various courts were united by arcades and within them were seven great gardens, a menagerie for lions and other beasts, an aviary for song birds and an aquarium.

But he had a more worthy title to be thought a great king than the splendour of his life. He restored the dilapidated power of the crown by using the programme of administrative reform put forward by the Estates General. They could only formulate it. He actually did what their disunion, their class and local jealousy, their lack of any true sense of the commonwealth as above their personal wealth, made them incapable of accomplishing. He put their programme into practice and the people of France

gave the credit to the crown and not to their own representatives.

His son Charles VI (1380–1422) inherited the throne at the age of eleven. The day after the funeral of Charles V, the four uncles of the boy King began to dispute over the government and at the consecration two of them had an unseemly struggle for the honour of sitting next to the King. They were agreed on only one thing and that was the humiliation of the trusted councillors of the late king who had risen by ability and royal favour without distinguished birth. The new government was put into the hands of a council of the four princes of the lilies and eight others under the presidency of the Duke of Anjou, the oldest of the princes. The council was at once called upon to meet revolts against the taxes in most of the larger cities of France; Rouen, Amiens, Orleans, Rheims, Béziers, Carcassonne, Ghent, Ypres. In Paris, a new tax on sales raised a riot which began with the killing of a tax collector in the market. A mob of four thousand seized arms in the arsenal and slaughtered sixteen Jews and Jewesses. Then they broke open the prisons and were for a time in possession of the city. The more well-to-do burghers took arms and suppressed these rioters called Maillotins. Their leaders were arrested, but joined the University in petitioning the crown to reduce taxes. The crown consented and then proceeded to punish the rioters. Seventeen had died by axe or gallows and two extra executioners had been appointed to speed up the work, when the restiveness of the city at the bloody vengeance suggested that it had better stop.

Not long after, the boy King led his army to help his vassal the Count of Flanders. The militia of the revolting great cities was surrounded in an unfavourable position and twenty-five thousand of them perished on the field of Rosebeque at the hands of the men-at-arms. The victors forbade any one to bury the dead, who were left

as "miscreants against God, their King and their Seigneur, to be eaten by dogs and carrion birds." For, in France as in England of that time the mere suggestion that the common people should have anything to do with government except to pay for it and occasionally die for it in war, provoked in the minds of many of the aristocratic class, a hatred so fierce that those who suffered from its malignant contagion could scarcely invent cruelties savage enough to relieve it.

The King took down from the walls of the cathedral of Courtrai the gilded spears of the knights which the Flemish burghers had hung there after their great victory eighty years before and entered Paris as a victor. More than three hundred leading citizens were arrested, new taxes were announced, and, in spite of the prayers of the University of Paris, the municipal liberties were abolished. A long list of victims went to death. Sixteen were taken to the gallows in one cart. Enormous fines were inflicted on those who escaped the axe or the rope. Similar savage repression was inflicted by the princes of the lilies on the cities all over France, which had objected to crushing or irresponsible taxation.

This reaction of the feudal nobility, headed by the members of the royal family, was somewhat checked when the King, at the age of twenty, suddenly took the reins into his own hands. He recalled to power the ancient councillors of his father who were mainly from the small nobility or the burghers, and the partisans of the dispossessed grand seigneurs called them in scorn "*the marmousets.*" They enabled him to complete the reorganization of the administrative machinery begun by his father, and to issue a remarkable series of *ordonnances* or royal laws.

In the midst of this activity, the King who burnt the candle at both ends, because of inordinate fondness for feastings, balls and costly ceremonies, suddenly went violently insane and for the next thirty years he had only

lucid intervals. In one of these intervals he renewed (1396) the truce with England for twenty-eight years longer and sealed it by marrying his little daughter, then seven, to the English King Richard II.

The madness of the King drove from court the old councillors of Charles V and returned to power the members of the royal family. The King's younger brother, the Duke of Orleans, ostensibly regent, had control of the government during the King's intervals of sanity, but when his mind clouded again, their uncle, the Duke of Burgundy, became the more powerful. The jealousy and struggle between the King's uncle and his brother was, by the year 1400, plain to all who knew anything of the inside of the court and when the Duke of Burgundy died, his son, John the Fearless, inherited the duchy and the quarrel. Both sides threatened civil war, but the other members of the royal family twice brought about apparent reconciliations. At one the two dukes dined together and slept in the same room. At the second "they kissed each other with tears of joy."

But underneath, bitter jealousy continued and, at the end of three years of hatred, the Duke of Orleans, returning to his palace in the dark of a November evening after a visit paid to the Queen was set upon in the streets of Paris by masked men who put his servants to flight and killed him. The Duke of Burgundy was one of the pall-bearers at the funeral the next day. When the council met the day after, the provost asked permission to search everywhere including the palaces of the princes. The three uncles of the King agreed. Whereupon John the Fearless asked two of them to step outside and confessed the murder; adding that the assassins were hidden in his palace. The following day, after being refused admission to the council, he mounted his horse and galloped out of the city.

All France took sides. The City of Paris, including the

University, was strongly for the Duke of Burgundy, together with his relatives, vassals and neighbours of the north and east of France. The other princes of the blood, together with many great lords of the center, south and west, backed the young Duke of Orleans. His party was known as the Armagnacs because its leader was the Count d'Armagnac, the father-in-law of the young Duke.

The quarrel dragged along and seven years after the murder, the Duke of Burgundy was banished as a traitor by the royal council controlled by the Armagnacs (Feb. 1414).

Burgundy had a ready helper at hand. Less than a year before this sentence, the capable and enterprising Henry V had succeeded his invalid father, Henry IV, on the throne of England. He now planned the conquest of France. With him the Duke of Burgundy made a secret offensive and defensive alliance. A year later Henry landed in France and easily took the port of Harfleur, "the key of Normandy." He then started to march to Calais.

At Agincourt only a few miles from the field where his great-grandfather won the battle of Crécy, his small force of 1,000 men-at-arms and not over 7,000 archers were overtaken by the army of France, which contained 14,000 men-at-arms and some 10,000 crossbowmen. But in spite of their overwhelming superiority in numbers, the French were no more a match for the picked and highly disciplined English army than their forebears had been at Crécy and Poitiers seventy years before. The organization of Charles V had apparently disappeared and there was no Du Guesclin to counteract the braggart rashness of the great lords. They made no use of their crossbowmen or artillery, and, though they borrowed enough of the English tactics to dismount, they were so impeded by their heavy armour in muddy soil, and by the extreme depth of the great mass of men they sent into the fight on

too narrow a front, that the English archers riddled them with their arrows and then running in, slaughtered them with heavy leaden mallets and hatchets until the dead and wounded were piled five feet high on the front and the rear French lines broke in panic. The English lost 16 men-at-arms and 100 archers. The French lost 1,500 nobles and knights and 5,000 men-at-arms, of whom two-thirds were of gentle blood. Five dukes were killed or captured.

But even this humiliating defeat could not dampen the infernal flames of hatred raging in France. Paris was held by the Armagnacs, but a conspiracy of the people opened the gates at night to 800 Burgundian men-at-arms, and the mob massacred 500 Armagnacs in the streets. The prisons were filled with the surviving chiefs of the faction. Two weeks later huge mobs visited all the prisons and slaughtered 1,600 Armagnacs to the cry of "*Vive le Roi et le Duc de Bourgogne.*" A month later the Duke of Burgundy came into the city and organized a government of his party. The Queen was with him and the mad King was a pawn in his hands.

The chief of the other party, now that the Constable was slaughtered with many leaders of the faction, was the Dauphin, then sixteen years old. He took the title of regent, and a considerable part of central and southern France acknowledged his authority. Another false reconciliation was arranged between the Dauphin and the Duke of Burgundy and they agreed to work together to expel the English. The bells of Paris were rung and a Te Deum was chanted in Notre Dame. But not a month had passed before at another interview held in the middle of a bridge a quarrel arose, the Dauphin withdrew and the Duke of Burgundy was killed. His son, Philip the Good, turned at once to the English and in 1420 he, the Queen and the mad King signed the treaty of Troyes with Henry V. This gave Catherine, their daughter, as wife to the English King and made him lawful King of

France at the death of Charles VI in the place of their own son Charles guilty of "huge and horrible crimes." The 1st of December, 1420, the English King entered Paris with his father-in-law, Charles VI, amid great acclamations and lodged at the Louvre. Already the University had accepted the treaty and a thinly attended meeting of the three Estates ratified it. Within two years, the old mad King and the vigorous young conqueror were dead and a child in his cradle, the son of Henry of England and Catherine of France, was proclaimed King of England and France by a title which, though acknowledged by north France and endorsed by the University of Paris, was without any warrant in law which was even colourable.

The baby King of France and England found a powerful defender in the Duke of Bedford, a younger brother of Henry V who shared his shrewd common sense and military ability. The legitimate French King was a shy lad of nineteen, whose favourite pleasure was to be alone, and a modern psychiatrist would have suspected that he might follow his father into intermittent madness. He was in the hands of as criminal and worthless a crowd of grafters as ever got control of any chief ruler whether king or president. Four of them three years before had murdered in his presence his cousin, the Duke of Burgundy. These servitors of the crown split into factions, which, in at least two instances, led to the murder of royal reigning favourites; crimes which the melancholy boy had not the spirit to resent. If he had been even one inch a king he could have driven the English back across the sea and forced their allies to their knees. As it was the war dragged on, and six years after the accession of the baby King of England and France, the invaders found the French so little to be feared that with only 3,000 men they formed the siege of Orleans.

Charles VII, whose capital was established at Bourges

not far off, was advised by some of his councilors to abandon his kingdom and take refuge in Castille or Scotland. To this cowardice he did not sink, but he sat helplessly by while a handful of English threatened to add to their mastery of western France—the possession of the key of central France.

Then suddenly, a woman—one of the most strange and beautiful figures in history—appeared to do for France what her king would not do.

Joan of Arc was born of well-to-do peasant parents in the little village of Domrémy in northeastern France. She never learned to read and write, but from early childhood she spent much time in prayer in the church, or in listening to the lives of the saints. Her village was somewhat sheltered from the storms of war, but it was plundered and burnt and stories of the widespread misery of France reached her ears. She laid her sorrow for them before the saints who were so real to her as to seem friends. At the age of thirteen she began to have visions and saw and heard St. Michael the glorious warrior of heaven. He bade her be ready, for God would aid her to go to the help of the King of France. When she was between sixteen and eighteen (she did not know her age exactly) these visions and voices urging her to go on her divine mission became more frequent, until she could resist no longer the sense of being called of God. She went to the nearby royal captain and asked to be taken to the Dauphin. The captain was doubtful. Might this not be a trick of the great enemy of mankind? He had her exorcised by the village priest and, as there was no sign of a devil, concluded that her mission was of God. Charles VII was also doubtful at first and turned all his theologians on her for weeks. They reported she was "humble, devout, honest and guileless."

So the King gave her a horse and armour, the bravest partisans came in from the frontier to join her and even

the young Duke of Alençon, nephew of the King, rode with the little army which marched to Orleans around Joan's white banner, which pictured God the Father blessing the lilies of France. There was long discussion of tactics and hesitation about frontal attack by the French captains, but finally the white banner, borne by the peasant girl confident of victory, went straight at the English and with a new spirit the French stormed one after another the three principal fortified camps around the city. During the third assault she was wounded by the bolt of a crossbow. She was taken to the rear and the attack slackened, but the indomitable girl advanced again with raised banner and touching the outer barrier with its point cried out to her hesitant men "Its all yours, go in." The next day the English, having lost very heavily, retreated.

The fame of the exploit ran like wild fire all over France, bringing courage to the partisans of the King of Bourges, as he was called in mockery, and dismay to the English and their Burgundian allies. At the head of 12,000 men Joan escorted the Dauphin to Rheims, where he was consecrated like his forefathers. Joan knelt to kiss his feet, calling out through her tears of happiness, "Good King, now the pleasure of God is done; for He wanted you to come to Rheims to receive your holy consecration to prove that you are the true King to whom the kingdom ought to belong." For seven years before Joan appeared the French had met nothing but defeat. In thirteen months of victory she rallied a host of new partisans and gained for her King a vast stretch of territory dividing the English on the west from their French allies, the Burgundians, on the north and east. She could do this because she restored that quality—fundamental even in the highly technical war of our own times—which the modern French call *la morale*.

About a year after her first victory, Joan in an unsuc-

cessful sortie from a besieged town was taken prisoner by a Burgundian partisan. Charles VII could easily have ransomed her or exchanged her for the English leader, Talbot, but, during six months he did nothing; a specimen of the ingratitude of kings even more inexcusable than the cowardly abandonment of Strafford by Charles I, two centuries later. Joan was finally sold to the English for 10,000 *livres tournois*. They were determined to burn her as a witch to restore the morale of their soldiers. Some of them probably thought she was a witch, for the belief in sorcery was widespread, and the strength of English prejudice against her made even the imagination of a Shakespeare, nearly two centuries later, paint a false and shameful caricature of her career.

Their French allies undertook to get her burnt according to the forms of law. She was cited to appear at Rouen before the Bishop of Beauvais, who was assisted in judgment by one hundred clergymen, of whom three were English and the rest Frenchmen of the Burgundian faction, including a group from the University of Paris headed by one of its most celebrated doctors of theology. She was kept in a dark dungeon with chains on her feet and for a month subjected, repeatedly and without counsel, to every subtlety of trained theological disputants and to every trick of the processes of the inquisition which for centuries had infected the criminal justice of Europe with cruelty and injustice. Her shrewd homely sense and straightforward piety kept her out of many of the traps set for her. For example, she was asked "Do you know that you are in the Grace of God?" The question was so perfidious, for either yes or no might be used against her, that one of the judges called out in protest that such a question ought not to be asked of a young girl, only to be told by the bishop to hold his tongue. But Joan avoided the trap. "If I am not," she said, "may God put me in it. If I am, may He keep me in it."

They got from her, however, heresy enough to condemn her, when after offering to say whatever the Pope demanded, she appealed against any sentence of the court, to God and the Virgin Mary by whom she had been sent to the King. The faculties of theology and canon law of the University of Paris sent a communication exhausting the resources of the ecclesiastical criminal vocabulary and calling for her death.

But she had appealed to the Pope and they could not burn her with any warrant of law unless she refused to recant. Before a great assembly she was accused of heresy and summoned three times to recant. She kept silence and they began to read the sentence to the stake. Then in sudden overmastering terror, she admitted whatever they asked and heard a sentence of imprisonment for life. The English were furious, but it was only a matter of time. Within a week Joan told the bishop God had rebuked her by St. Catherine and St. Margaret for having abjured to save her life and, as he left the prison, the bishop said to the English captain, "Be of good cheer. It is finished." For a relapsed heretic there was only one destination—the stake. The poor child had evidently believed from her voices that she would be saved from her enemies, and when she was told she must be burnt, the horror of it broke her down. She tore her hair and screamed in agony, saying her voices had deceived her.

English soldiers led her through the streets to carry out the sentence of French judges. On her head was a grotesque mitre inscribed *relapsed heretic, apostate idolater.* Just before the pyre was lighted she found strength to see that the door of release from her enemies promised by her saints was the flaming door of death. She cried out that her voices came from God and had not deceived her. The last thing she said as the flame and smoke rolled up around was "Jesus—Jesus." So fanatic theologians and unscrupulous politicians and superstitious soldiers

burnt the brave peasant girl to ashes in the market place of Rouen. But amid the heroes of the nations her pure and noble personality stands out; "fair as a star when only one is shining in the sky."

After long years of anarchy, peace was made with Philip of Burgundy who swore to forget the murder of his father (1435). The next year Paris was taken with the help of an insurrection of the people and when a five years' truce was made in 1444, the English had been confined to the western provinces of Normandy and Guienne. When war was renewed, a year's fighting drove the English from Normandy. The conquest of the southwestern province of Guienne, which had belonged to the English crown for three centuries, was more difficult. But, in 1453, the veteran English leader, Talbot, committed a mistake like that of the French at Crécy when they despised the new English weapon, the longbow. He assaulted the French entrenched camp at Castillon in spite of its defence by 300 small pieces of artillery. His force was cut to pieces and he was killed.

Guienne was conquered in detail by Charles VII but the French failed to show their usual capacity for conciliating and absorbing subdued peoples. The province was so harshly treated that many of its inhabitants fled to England or Spain. The docks of the busy port of Bordeaux decayed and great stretches of the fertile vineyards of the Médoc grew up to weeds. A century later, dislike of France and regret for the old English rulers were still latent and ready to be developed in the civil wars about religion.

CHAPTER XXI

THE GREAT MISERY. FRENCH COURAGE. THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY. GALLICANISM. THE NOBILITY OF THE ROBE

For more than a century and a quarter France had been intermittently subjected to terrible misery. Some thirty years after this suffering began (1360) an Italian who revisited France wrote, "I could not believe that this was the same kingdom which I had once seen so rich and flourishing. I saw nothing but a fearful solitude, extreme poverty, waste land, houses in ruins. Even in the suburbs of Paris there were everywhere signs of destruction and burning. The streets were deserted, the roads overrun by weeds, the whole a vast solitude."

When the war was raging the inhabitants were subject to pillage by the invaders, and, during the intervals of peace, they had been at the mercy of wandering bands of mercenary soldiers. These were organized and led by various sorts of soldiers of fortune from both sides, English, Germans, Welsh, Lorrainers, Gascons, Spaniards. During the long dragging ending of the war, these bands earned the name of *les Ecorcheurs,* the Skinners. They often added to greed and cruelty a wild rage of destruction. When they found the gates of some town closed against them, they turned their fury on the villages whose inhabitants had taken refuge inside the walls. They cut down the vines, girdled the fruit trees, trampled young grain, dumped the wine they could not drink into the rivers, smashed the carts and wrecked the mills. These "Skinners" wandered into all parts of France, but the neighbourhood of Paris was one of the most miserable. People died in the streets of cold and hunger. Wolves

prowled through the suburbs killing women who ventured outside the walls, and sometimes even slipping into the city itself and eating children. This devastation, carried on intermittently both in war and peace for more than a century, finally, in many places, turned the countryside into a desert. In 221 rural parishes near Rouen the population was decreased two-thirds. Around Senlis, twelve villages, flourishing at the beginning of the fourteenth century, had not a single inhabitant left by the middle of the fifteenth. The once prosperous city of Limoges, after it was taken and 3,000 of its people, men, women and children, massacred by order of the Black Prince, long remained a ruin. Seventy years later it had only five inhabitants.

Toward the end of the war, after the crown had made peace with Burgundy, action began to be taken against the Skinners. The King led an expedition into Champagne, and arrested the Bastard, brother of the Duke of Bourbon, and his subordinates. The Bastard was drowned and twenty other captains ended their lives by rope or axe. Gradually this plague of discharged soldiers was cured by force or by finding employment for them outside of France. The best of them were enrolled in the new royal army.

When Joan of Arc appeared France seemed to be on the point of becoming, at least for a time, a mere geographical expression. Few civilized people have recovered so entirely from a ruin apparently so complete. It was the earliest great demonstration of the special capacity of the French people, more marked than that of any other people in history, of which they have recently made so extraordinary a display—the latent power to restore, by steadfast labour, the fertility of wasted soil and to rebuild the most terrible ruins of war. Historians have been accustomed to speak of the French as a military people, and their history is filled with fighting in civil

wars and the foreign wars to which the geographical position of France has especially exposed—or tempted—her. But the fundamental quality of the French people is not the courage of the battlefield. It is that more difficult form of courage—the courage of peace; which has inspired them again and again to attack ruin undismayed and to save their country by tireless industry.

For this restoration France found a competent leader in her King. With the end of the war Charles VII had much to do. He led an army into Guienne, and was as active in government as during his youth he had been supine. Of all the list of kings nerveless in the face of disaster not one—not even James II of England—deserved to lose his crown as much as Charles VII deserved to lose the crown Joan of Arc saved for him. But, when he was about thirty-five, there occurred in his character an extraordinary change; like those which occur in morbid brain conditions and are labelled by the psychiatrists double personality, or like the complete dominance of conduct by new motives and desires, which is sometimes brought about by emotional and moral shock in religious conversion. [William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience.*] The change in the character of Charles VII was not as abrupt as other instances of this sort of change, but it was as complete. The influence of the worthless crowd of parasites which surrounded him was broken. Habile and loyal men, soldiers, bishops, nobles, came into the royal councils. With these councillors the once lazy king worked regularly and punctually. By their advice the once dreamy royal recluse began to appear at the head of his armies. With their help, he repaired the organization of government, took advantage of the popular devotion to the royalty which Joan of Arc had incarnated, and prepared the way for that dominance of the crown over all other sources of power, aristocratic, municipal, provincial, clerical, which his son Louis XI was to achieve.

He undertook extensive legal reforms. The character of the judges was improved. Regular salaries lessened the danger of bribery, and the right of parlement to nominate for a vacancy in its ranks three candidates of whom the king chose one, was established. In spite of the opposition of the Parlement of Paris, he created provincial courts. He confirmed the Parlement of Grenoble founded by his son and founded the Parlement of Languedoc.

The cities had done their full share in the delivery of the kingdom from the invader. They had not only contributed heavily to the taxes, but had given provisions, made cannon and sent their companies of crossbowmen to the royal armies. When the war was over, their citizens were tired of struggle and anxious only for peace and the rebuilding of their prosperity. They fell easy victims to the skillful agents of the crown, who gradually ignored their privileges. Under cover of an alleged desire to help the financial distress into which all the cities had been plunged by the war, they were forbidden to tax themselves for local purposes except by permission of the king. They were thus deprived of that determining element in all liberty, the power of the purse.

This fundamental right of constitutional government had been asserted during the war by the Estates. They had claimed the right of assent to new taxation and even to regulate the expenditure of the money voted. But they had been strong only because the crown was weak. The representative assemblies of the fifteenth century, who seemed for a time about to acquire some power in the state, never developed a national feeling in their own body. Local and class feeling was still too strong and they failed to take advantage of the opportunity to become, like the English Parliament, an organ of government. They submitted to being used by the crown as mere expedients in desperate emergencies. In the latter part of the reign of Charles VII, the right of assent to

taxation, used for a time, disappeared, and the taxes which had been voted as temporary sacrifices, were imposed year after year without troubling to consult the Estates of the realm. The king collected his money directly from the estates of the separate provinces. These retained considerable local power, but there was no one who could speak for the realm of France except the king.

All that the Estates had done during the fourteenth century in the effort to save the realm from ruin and conquest, accrued to the benefit of the crown, and the patriotism of France took the form of loyalty to the divinely anointed successor of the sainted Louis. To his marked personality there answered across the generations the wondrous figure of the martyred peasant maid, who felt herself called of God to bring the rightful king to the holy place at Rheims that the divine anointing might fit him to be the saviour of his people. This growing reverence for the "divinity which doth hedge a King" protected the kings of France from Hugh Capet to Henry III (987 to 1589), against the knife of the assassin and the sword of the battlefield, whereas, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, five kings of England died by violence. It was the feeling that this was the underlying meaning in the extraordinary career of Joan which led the same King who had basely abandoned her, to begin, twenty years after her death, a successful attempt to wipe from her memory the stain of heresy and sorcery. The chief motive in this action was not remorse for injustice to her, but a desire to exalt the monarchy for which she died. This is evident beyond question in the first sentences of the tractate written at the King's order, which opened the revision of her legal process. It is entitled "For the exaltation of the King of France and the Honour of the Royal House of France," and it begins as follows: "It is against the honour of the Most Christian King to accept in silence an iniquitous and scandalous sentence, dishon-

ouring to the royal crown, promulgated by that Bishop of Beauvais who was the King's enemy. What a stain it would be upon the royal throne if our adversaries should persuade posterity that the King of France had received into his army a heretic who invoked the help of the devil!" A commission led by the Archbishop of Rheims, after hearing 115 witnesses in favour of Joan, revoked the process of the former tribunal as illegal in form and false in verdict.

From the beginning of the fourteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century the relations of France to the Papacy had been extremely varied. The final outcome of the humiliation of Boniface VIII by Philip the Fair in 1303 had been what is known to historians as the Babylonian Captivity of the Church. By this they mean a period of seventy years in which the people of God were captive in a foreign land. For the Papacy, abandoning its seat in Rome, the ancient centre of the world, and hence, symbolically weakening its claim to be the head of all Christendom, established its seat at Avignon on the banks of the Rhone and became Gallicized. It loaned huge sums of money to the French throne, and the college of cardinals, which elected the popes, became all but entirely filled by subjects or vassals of the French king. The impression this made on the world was roughly expressed by the victorious English soldiers at Poitiers in 1356 when they sang: "If the Vicar of Christ is French, Christ Himself is English."

The return of the Papacy from Avignon to Rome in 1377 was evidently premature, for it was followed by the Great Schism, which lasted for forty years, and showed the world the spectacle of two and finally three Vicars of Christ, each of whom claimed to send the others to hell by the authority of God. The rising disgust and wrath of all decent churchmen finally brought about the Council of Constance (1414–1418), the most fully repre-

sentative assembly ever held in Europe before the annual assemblies of the League of Nations. The University of Paris furnished, in the theory of conciliar supremacy, a logical basis for this action in which one of the three popes had been forced by practical needs to join. According to this doctrine, the supreme authority is a General Council of the Church which has, by the gift of the Holy Ghost, power given of God to reach an infallible decision in all questions of faith and discipline. The delegates of France at Constance by their learned eloquence, succeeded in leading the Council to accept this theory and to base upon it procedure which got rid of all three popes, and elected a new pope in a conclave where representatives of the chief nations voted with the cardinals. To this new Pope and his successors the council committed the duty of reforming the Church in head and members and of reporting to councils to be called at intervals of ten years. In short, at a time when the one universal institution of Christendom seemed in danger of breaking to pieces by the internecine strife of its leaders, France, "the eldest daughter of the Church," rallied Christendom to save the ancient mother. It was by the intellectual leadership of France, elaborating the doctrine of conciliar supremacy, that the Papacy was relaunched upon a new career.

No pope of the new line ever seriously considered reporting to a decennial council. Within a half century any attempt to compel a pope to do so was denounced in a Papal bull as an "execrable and unheard of heresy." As for the reform of the Church in head and members which the Council had declared the first duty of the Papacy, no pope for more than two hundred years seriously undertook any thorough-going, widespread reform. The French doctrine of conciliar supremacy won therefore a valueless victory.

France, however, stood by the doctrine of the Univer-

sity of Paris and it became the foundation stone of the peculiar French national attitude toward the Church, which subsisted into the last century and is known as gallicanism. It added to conciliar supremacy, the God-given temporal authority of kings and certain ancient liberties of the French Church. Fully developed gallicanism appears in the Pragmatic Sanction issued at Bourges by Charles VII in 1438 as a fundamental principle of the French state and the French Church. This document begins by denouncing the abuses by which the Church of France is made the victim "of insatiable cupidity." It asserts the doctrine of conciliar supremacy, and demands a decennial ecumenical council. It then suppresses annates which was the heaviest item in papal taxation of the churches. It went on to limit the facility of appeal to the pope, and denied the papal power to appoint bishops and abbots.

This document was evidently not the expression of pure zeal on the part of the King for the independence and spirituality of the clergy, for it gave him the right to make "benignant requests" to canonical chapters and convents in regard to the election of abbots and bishops. His requests were pressing and respected, and princes and great lords successfully followed his example. But if the bishops, ostensibly elected under the Pragmatic Sanction, were not always more spiritually minded than some of those appointed by popes carefully distributing ecclesiastical patronage to their friends, they were, at least, always native Frenchmen and not absentee Italians.

Some of the changes which took place in France from the beginning of the fourteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century were not entirely due to the Hundred Years War.

The freeing of the serfs and the creation of a class of free agricultural labourers had begun generations before, and it had made great progress during the century of

prosperity which preceded that century of loss and misery. The increased population demanded more food, which raised the price of land and led to the clearing of great stretches of forest. The demand for labour raised wages and enabled the servile classes to obtain charts of emancipation. The small nobility declined in comparative economic and social power and aggravated the situation by extravagance. Small farms transferable from father to son by a title almost equivalent to ownership, grew up as the lords of the manor declined. Historians are inclined to the opinion that in some parts towards the end of the fifteenth century, the division of land among small owners was as marked as it is to-day, when one-fifth of the total population own real estate and over 85 per cent of the 5,700,000 farms do not exceed 25 acres.

The Hundred Years War reduced a considerable part of the farms of France to waste. It became a proverb in one of the western provinces: "The English brought the forests into France." With the forests came wolves, and at the end of the war, great hunts had to be organized in some places to free the country-side of this plague. The people who were willing to restore the wastes could dictate their own terms, and too many questions would not be asked of a runaway serf with stout arms. Serfhood did not disappear, but great numbers of serfs were freed and the wages of free agricultural labourers were higher than ever before known. The soil, however, could not be at once restored to its former productivity and suffering continued. Six years after the last English army was defeated, the Estates of Languedoc declared that, in spite of the peace, a third of the population of the province had perished by famine in the last ten years.

At the beginning of the eleventh century there were in the social organization of western Europe only two sorts of people who counted, the clergy and the nobles. Outside of these two classes or estates, there were only more

or less wretched serfs who worked to give them food and clothes. In the twelfth century there began to appear a third class or estate, the burghers or city dwellers. As we have seen this new or third estate became very early divided into two sections, the patricians or *haute bourgeoisie* and the common urban people or *petite bourgeoisie*. It is always the case that war, which brings loss and misery to the mass, brings riches to some. In spite of the apparent ruin of commerce in general, a number of the *haute bourgeoisie* of the first half of the fifteenth century made large fortunes. Jacques Cœur, son of a well-to-do furrier, acquired, by bold and unscrupulous operations in Oriental trade, mining, banking, the manufacture of silk, dye-stuffs, paper, etc., the first enormous European fortune comparable to the huge modern fortunes of the nineteenth century. Many capitalists imitated him with greater or less success. These men of the wealthier burghers began to enter into royal, or princely, service and found there great opportunities for profit. They bought land and came into social relation with the smaller nobles or country gentry. Many of these had suffered from the war because they had been held to ransom. Even those who had gained by plunder more than they had lost, were ruined by extravagance. They naturally sought to recoup the family fortunes by marrying their children to the heirs or heiresses of the new rich neighbours who had built the splendid manor houses nearby. So, by the union of the lower nobles and the higher burghers there arose a class intermediate between the nobility and the third estate out of which was to come the *nobility of the robe,* as distinguished from the *nobility of the sword.*

As is always the case, the moral wounds of the dragging Hundred Years War were as marked as the physical wounds. The most outstanding instance of crime in that epoch is the case of Baron Gilles de Rais, the head of the nobles of Brittany, possessed of huge estates, a brave

soldier, created a marshal of France at twenty-five. That sadistic degenerate practised his bestial crimes for eight years before he was accused by the Bishop of Nantes of sorcery and murder. He said he had never been able to raise the devil in spite of many attempts to do so; though some of his helpers in the black art reported having seen the fiend when their master was absent. Under the indictment for murder, however, it was proved that he had murdered at least one hundred and forty children. Threatened with torture, he made a full public confession and was beheaded after expressing his firm hope "of seeing God in the great joy of Paradise." During the execution a huge crowd around the scaffold chanted psalms and prayers for the repentant sinner.

Such a criminal career is of course exceptional in the annals of crime for all ages, but many things suggest that the moral standard of the fifteenth century was extremely low. Perhaps the strongest single suggestion of the brutality of the time is the revival of slavery. Turks, Egyptians, negroes were freely sold through the south of France. The white slave traffic made its appearance, for, in the province of Roussillon, the larger part of the female slaves were white girls from the Black Sea. It is reported that at a single hospital at one time fifty wet nurses suckled the children which these white slaves had borne to their masters, burghers of the city. In recovering from the moral ravages of war the French people were not helped by the example of their King. He made of the beautiful, but greedy and corrupt Agnes Sorel the first specimen of what might be called a social functionary who was to become very prominent at the French court; the *maîtresse en titre* of the king. After the death of Agnes, he travelled about the kingdom with a sort of harem. However, this was according to the fashion of the time. His great opponent Philip, Duke of Burgundy, is said to have had in succession twenty-four known mistresses.

CHAPTER XXII

ART AND LETTERS SURVIVE MISERY. (1328–1453)

In spite of ruin and demoralization the life of the spirit did not altogether fail during this period of misery. Architecture, in which France had so long led the European world, continued to develop along the lines of its own traditions. The violence of war and the neglect it compelled, brought about the dilapidation of many churches. But, even before the war was ended, a process of restoration began in the cathedrals of Tours, Bourges, etc., and in a great number of smaller churches. Architects were employed more widely than ever before in the service of the laity. Scarcely was the war over, when men began to leave the ruined donjons in defensible positions, for pleasanter manor houses in the meadows by the banks of the rivers and the foundations were laid for that series of châteaux, which, in the development of the next century, filled the smiling valley of the Loire. Some unknown architect built in Bourges for the self-made millionaire Jacques Cœur, one of the most beautiful city houses in which any rich man has ever lived and many other burghers who had gained fortunes, in spite of the war or because of it, found architects to gratify their tastes or their pride by beautiful homes within the walls of cities all over France.

The most celebrated works of the French sculptors and bronze casters of the fifteenth century have perished; like the bronze monument which the inhabitants of Orleans reared in 1457 to the memory of their deliverer, Joan of Arc. The most distinguished of these works seem to have been tombs and these tombs, as well as all the products of the art of France, seem to have been dependent upon the influence of Burgundy and Flanders; a nondescript con-

geries of feudal states and great municipalities, partly vassals of France and partly vassals of the German empire, whose only centre was the ducal crown of Burgundy. The masterpiece of the Flemish-Burgundian school of sculpture was the monument of Duke Philip the Bold, made in the beginning of the fifteenth century and now in the museum at Dijon. It shows the Duke recumbent on a high table around which hooded figures known as the "mourners" are moving in procession. The method and the form of the monument became stereotyped and, for a long while, tyrannised over the creative power of French artists.

The only outstanding painter of the time was Fouquet. He raised the art of miniature painting to a point from which it could develop no further. His best parchments, without ceasing to be highly decorative, became little pictures where are presented with exquisite delicacy and boundless patience, a host of figures and details with which other artists would fill great canvases. Fouquet also painted some vivid portraits and his skill as a painter of lifelike portraits was recognized even in Italy, whose art was then so vigorous and rich.

In the arts of luxury France was distinguished for the superb tapestries of Arras which in English gave the name of this town to all artistic wall hangings.

The long war did not destroy the appetite for learning. In the twenty years before its last battle, five universities were founded in the realm, Caen, Poitiers, Angers, Bordeaux and Valence. Schools, parish or municipal, were founded freely, and, even before the war was entirely finished, these establishments were crowded with students. But in these universities and schools there was little breath of strong intellectual life such as was stirring in Italy. In the old kitchen Latin they were apt to put their students through the old desiccated logomachies. Their doctors only chewed the cud of ancient disputations, for

there was not enough intellectual energy in the theological world to produce a single homegrown heresy to give them something new to discuss.

As the appetite for learning had not been destroyed by the long misery of the war, so the love of beauty in letters and art survived misery. The custom firmly established at the beginning of the fourteenth century, for princes and great lords to become patrons of arts and letters on a large scale, continued even through the war. The Dukes of Burgundy, who, because of their income from the great commercial cities of the Netherlands, were richer than any kings, loved the rôle of Mæcenas. Philip the Good, in the first half of the fifteenth century, had the largest and most superbly bound library perhaps in Europe; certainly north of the Alps. He kept a great force of copyists and illuminators and sent translators on long journeys to add inaccessible manuscripts to his collection. He supported the stage and gave freely pensions for men of letters. In short, he spent money openhandedly in what was partly an expression of personal taste, partly a political expedient (it gained his nickname of the Good), and partly a vulgar love of luxury and display. Other princes and great lords, the Duke of Anjou, the Duke of Bourbon, the Duke of Brittany, etc., followed his example with less zeal and less wealth.

Under these fostering influences, it is not astonishing that there grew up a school of gentlemen poets. The courtiers of these princes were expected to write poetry as their ancestors had been expected to ride a horse. The pen became, like the sword, a sort of additional symbol of a firm position in the first social circles. For, in that time, as a poet sang, every well brought up young gentleman must know how to "sing, to dance, to make songs and rhyme ballades and all other gay amusements." This school of gentlemen poets found for its leader a true poet able to handle his flimsy themes with a delicacy exquisite

as the little spiders' webs in the grass on dewy mornings.

Charles, Duke of Orleans, grandson of one King of France, father of another and uncle of a third, was one of the four great feudatories of the French crown in the fifteenth century. His life divides readily into three parts. A luxurious youth ended at the battle of Agincourt, where he shared with the Duke of Bourbon the command-in-chief. He spent the next twenty-five years as a prisoner of state in England—well entertained, popular with the ladies, allowed to hunt and even to make short visits to France; but still a prisoner of state. He returned with impaired health and a fortune ruined by his ransom, to pass the last twenty-five years of his life quietly in his château at Blois. He was an intellectual descendant of that Guillaume, Duke of Aquitaine, who three hundred years before led the troubadours in singing of love and conventionalized nature. All his life from the age of ten to his death in his seventy-fifth year, Charles of Orleans wrote poems; five hundred and fifteen in number, and so little that all of them can be included in two very small volumes. He was a shining avatar of a sort of poetry which has found its most luminous form in French and is suggested by Rostand, writing of one of his own plays:

"Des costumes clairs, des rimes légères,
L'Amour, dans un parc, jouant du flûteau.

. . . . . .

Un repos naif des pièces amères
Un peu de musique, un peu de Watteau."

Here is one of the poems on Spring of Charles of Orleans:

"The year has changed his mantle cold
Of wind, of rain, of bitter air;
And he goes clad in cloth of gold,
Of laughing suns and season fair;
No bird or beast of wood or wold
But doth with cry or song declare

The year lays down his mantle cold.
All founts, all rivers seaward rolled,
The pleasant summer livery wear,
With silver studs on broidered vair;
The world puts off its raiment old,
The year lays down his mantle cold."

The fifteenth century produced the first great French poet whose personality is known and it was the most singular personality among all the distinguished votaries of the muses. François Villon, the child of respectable burghers who were poor, was sent to the University of Paris by a relative who was chaplain of the collegiate church of St. Benedict. Francis showed enough industry to take the degree of Master of Arts at the usual age; apparently a task not too laborious. But he learned more than the information necessary to pass his examinations. Avid of pleasure and hating work like a tramp, he followed comrades, several of whom died on the gallows, into the stews of Paris. His character went to pieces and he sank lower and lower, until he became, in the words of his best biographer, "a loafer, a hard drinker, a gambler, a swindler, a thief, a picklock, and a parasite upon prostitutes." In a gutter brawl he killed with his knife a priest who stabbed him in the face. The poet fled, and, after a year, his friends obtained his pardon. Six years later, after a joyous supper, he was involved in another street brawl in which some one stabbed a priest, and Villon was condemned to be hanged. A last desperate appeal to the Parlement of Paris gained, evidently to his surprise, a commutation of his sentence to ten years banishment from the city "because of the evil life of the said Villon." During that banishment he died, when and where we do not know.

The poetry of Villon, as might be expected from his life, is without the slightest suggestion that this world is a beautiful place. He is a child of the gutters who hates nature. And in the city he does not see the Quais at eve-

ning or the towers of the cathedral lifted against the morning sky. His intense gifts of keen observation and of masterly painting, are used to show us the men and women whose lives he knew or, sometimes, little street scenes like Dutch etchings. He has an infinite variety of emotion as he passes rapidly from laughter to tears. But the clearest and most original picture he paints is the picture of himself; for he is the first French poet to "take himself as the central subject of his work." This "personal poetry" which the songs of Heine bring to perfection "earns for him the name of the first of the modern poets."

The theme which comes back to him the most often is the theme of death. Now it moves him to a gentle melancholy as in the best known of all his poems "The Ballad of Dead Ladies":

"Tell me now what hidden way is
Lady Flora the lovely Roman?
Where's Hipparchia and where is Thais,
Neither of them the fairer woman?
Where is Echo, beheld of no man,
Only heard on river and mere,—
She whose beauty was more than human?
But where are the snows of yester year?

. . . . . .

Nay never ask this week, fair lord,
Where they are gone, nor yet this year,
Save with this much for an overword,—
But where are the snows of yester year?"

(D. G. ROSSETTI.)

Different is the thought of death in this epitaph he wrote for himself and his comrades when he was expecting to be hanged with them:

"Brothers and men that shall after us be,
Let not your hearts be hard to us:
For pitying this our misery
Ye shall find God more piteous.
Look on us six that are hanging thus,

And for the flesh that so much we cherished
How it is eaten of birds and perished,
And ashes and dust fill our bones place,
Mock not at us that so feeble be,
But pray God pardon us out of His grace.

. . . . . .

The rain out of heaven has washed us clean,
The sun has scorched us black and bare,
Ravens and rooks have pecked at our eyne,
And feathered their nests with our beards and hair.
Round are we tossed, and here and there,
This way and that, at the wild wind's will,
Never a moment my body is still;
Birds they are busy about my face.
Live not as we, nor fare as we fare;
Pray God pardon us out of His grace.

L'ENVOY

Prince Jesus, Master of all, to thee
We pray hell gain no mastery,
That we come never anear that place;
And ye men, make no mockery,
Pray God, pardon us out of His grace."

(A. LANG.)

If Villon ever amended we do not know, but that there were in his heart still unpolluted depths out of which repentance could rise, is shown by these stanzas from "His Mother's Service to Our Lady."

"A pitiful poor woman, shrunk and old,
I am and nothing learned in letter lore.
Within my parish cloister I behold
A painted heaven where harps and lutes adore,
And eke an hell whose damned folk seethe full sore:
One bringeth fear, the other joy to me.
That joy, Great Lady, make Thou mine to be,—
Thou of whom all must ask it even as I;
And that which faith desires, that let it see.
For in this faith I choose to live and die.

Oh excellent Virgin Princess! Thou didst bear
King Jesus, the most excellent comforter,
Who even of this our weakness craved a share
And for our sake stooped to us from on high,

Offering to death His young life sweet and fair.
Such as He is, Our Lord I Him declare,
And in this faith I choose to live and die."

(D. G. ROSSETTI.)

The poems of Villon were not printed until some twenty-five years after his death and then, in fifty years, they ran through more than thirty editions. For nearly two hundred years they slumbered again to awake in the last century and find their true descendant in Verlaine; "a modern Villon, like the former one alternately loving Fat Peg and the Virgin Mary, and like him too, able to keep alive amid his filth a flower of rare poetry."

CHAPTER XXIII

LOUIS XI CONSOLIDATES FRANCE

Those who profit by abuses are always angered by reforms and men whose incapacity to use power is evident to all but themselves, usually resent fiercely the loss of power. Before the English war was entirely finished, the attempts to reorganize the government through the trained skill of new councillors produced a rebellion, headed by the Dukes of Bourbon, Alençon and Brittany. It was popularly known as the Praguerie because of a similar rebellion of nobles centering in Prague, the capital of Bohemia. This movement, which had no motive but personal greed and ambition, the King mastered by a judicious mixture of bribery and force in which the royal train of artillery was of great service.

The member of this conspiracy who troubled the King the most was his own son the Dauphin, a boy already showing marked administrative ability, but so consumed by ambition that he could not wait for his father to die. The King did his best to make friends with him. But Louis preferred to take refuge with the Duke of Burgundy who was always fishing in troubled waters and anxious to weaken the crown of France. So the Duke for six years made an honoured guest of the young man, who as King of France was to bring ruin to his house. Charles VII sent him a sarcastic message which took the popular form, "My cousin of Burgundy is feeding the fox that will eat his chickens." No reconciliation ever came with the cankered boy, who longed for his father's death. Charles VII died firmly persuaded that he had been poisoned by his eldest son.

He left to that son, Louis XI, a disciplined, paid army,

a reformed and extended judiciary, an improved system of administration, a country, rapidly recovering from the waste of war, in which the cult of the king as the mouthpiece and defender of the nation, was stronger than ever before. The royal power had a solid base in permanent and regular taxation. There were three chief sources of income: the *taille*, a tax on landed property, from which nobles and clergymen were exempt; the *aide*, a tax on the price of all merchandise; the *gabelle du sel*, a monopoly of the sale of salt. In spite of these taxes, which Charles VII had levied for some thirty years without consulting the Estates General, he left no royal treasure to his son who had great need of it. For the plans of Louis XI and the way he carried them out, caused him to spend more money than any previous King of France, with resulting taxes which "exceeded all precedent."

His personality as it is described for us by one who knew him well, is one of the most singular among those who have worn the crown of France. He was firmly convinced of his own divine right to rule without hindrance or limitation; though it was his habit to take full advice before he decided upon action. Every week regularly he touched for the king's evil, or scrofula, any who came to be healed; a royal miracle which was supposed to attest the divine function of kings. The huge sums of money Louis XI raised by exorbitant taxation were not spent in display. He is sometimes called the burgher King because he hated all the costly swagger of the age; when chivalry was going to seed. He gave no balls, banquets nor tournaments to relieve an atmosphere which the younger lords and ladies found deadly dull. He believed that the eye of the master makes good workmen and often travelled about his kingdom, clothed like a pilgrim in coarse gray cloth and riding a soft paced mule. He hated formal receptions with much oratory and sometimes slipped into cities by a back street to avoid those he could

not discourage. He much preferred dinner with some burgher or some petty favourite to palace banquets. In spite of the easy gaited mule, however, he was a good horseman and the only taste of a knightly "courtois" sort he retained was stag hunting, "which he knew as well as any man of his time."

But he was only able to enjoy it part of the year because, all his life, he was engaged intermittently in wars, broken by short truces when winter closed the campaigning season. He hated fighting, though he did not lack courage and he was always scheming to bring about an advantageous peace. But no sooner was peace, or truce, established, than his restless mind began to dream of gains to his power and territory in new wars. These wars were really internecine strifes and his object in them was to break the power of the great feudal and princely houses.

The first of them was afterwards called the War of the Public Good "because it was undertaken upon that pretence." It represented very much the same sort of a coalition as the conspiracy called the Praguerie of which Louis the XI while Dauphin had been the figurehead against his own father. The rebels put about a hundred thousand men into the field, but the leaders soon began to fall out and differ over the division of the spoils they hoped to make. The King avoided pitched battles, fought at times when he caught his enemies napping, and bribed heavily at all times. So in the end he came out the master with a much increased royal domain.

The greatest antagonist of Louis XI was his ostensible vassal, Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, whose father had fought his father for years. Charles had inherited and acquired a rich territory running across northern France and into the Netherlands. Commines, who began public office in the Duke's employ, writes: "I think I have seen and known the greatest part of Europe; yet I never knew any province or country, even though of

much larger extent, so abounding in money, so extravagantly fine in trappings for their horses, so sumptuous in their buildings, so profuse in their expenses, so luxurious in their feasts and entertainments and so prodigal in all respects as the subjects of the Dukes of Burgundy." Charles the Bold, who inherited this wealth, was possessed by an ambition as insatiable as that of Louis XI and, in addition, was misled by a swollen self confidence to refuse all advice which traversed the bent of an obstinate will. He was as false and as cruel as Louis, but lacked the latter's common sense and capacity to estimate what was possible.

The Duke persuaded his brother-in-law, Edward IV of England, to renew the claim to the throne of France and an English army landed at Calais. Louis the XI, however, bought the King of England off for seventy-five thousand écus down and fifty thousand a year and the Duke was forced to make a truce for nine years. His ambition and lack of restraint had involved him in a struggle with the Swiss, with whom Louis XI had made a close alliance. Three times within ten months the hardy mountaineers routed the Burgundian army and, in the last battle, Charles the Bold lost his life. His rich dominions went to pieces and the triumphant Louis seized such portions of it as he could conquer and incorporate into the royal domain. There was no vassal and no combination of vassals in the realm able to threaten the power of the crown. The King was even strong enough to execute two great nobles, the Constable of St. Pol and the Duke of Nemours, for treason; and the execution of great nobles, common in England, had not been known in France.

Louis XI was a master of the astute and unscrupulous politics of the Italian tyrants afterwards codified by Macchiavelli in his *Prince*. A Milanese ambassador wrote back: "It seems as if the King had been born in Italy and always lived there." One of the maxims adopted

by Macchiavelli, that it is better for a prince to be feared than to be loved, Louis XI clearly acted on. He cut off the heads of the Constable and the Duke of Nemours in order to strike terror into the nobles and he took a number of less notable enemies from the courts and sent them summarily to the gallows. His favourite method of punishment was imprisonment in an iron cage eight feet square and seven high. The bishop who invented these instruments for the King spent fourteen years in one. He also ordered heavy and terrible fetters to be made in Germany which his prisoners wore. They were known as the King's nets and Commines tells us "I have seen many eminent and deserving persons in these prisons and these nets, who were afterwards advanced to places of trust and received great rewards from the King."

He treated the Church more despotically than any king before him. He cast bishops into prison and allowed no appeal to Rome. His treatment of ecclesiastical appointments may be inferred from this letter he addressed to the canons of the Cathedral of Angers. "Dear and well beloved, we have written to you two or three times to elect Master Augier de Brye our councillor and you have not done it. Therefore immediately on the receipt of this elect him; for we will on no account suffer anybody but him to have the bishopric; because if I know any man who opposes it, I will without fail drive him out of the Kingdom of France." He refused to allow the inquisition to function in France and decreed that all cases of heresy should be brought before his great council. Nevertheless, he was strict about the observances of religion and gave great sums to the shrines of the saints and the churches. But it does not appear that religious feeling had much control over his conduct and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that he was giving to the saints very much as he gave to adherents he hoped to gain or keep because he needed their help.

Louis XI did more for the organization and protection of industries, transportation and commerce than any of his predecessors. He had planned other reforms for the advantage of his subjects; a simplification of legal process, a code of the laws in French, uniform weights and measures throughout the kingdom, etc., but, when he had conquered peace he had little time for reform. "And up to this time he had oppressed and tyrannized over his people more than any of his predecessors." Commines might ask rhetorically "Is there any king or prince upon earth who has power except by tyranny and violence to raise one penny outside of the royal domain without the consent of the poor subject who is to pay it?" But the kings of France he knew raised in taxes whatever they needed and they thought the people could pay. The Estates General met but once during the reign of Louis XI and they said nothing about taxes. Probably because they preferred the King for a master to the great feudal nobles he was fighting.

Another contemporary observer, Sir John Fortescue, ex-chief justice of England, ex-member of Parliament, ex-ambassador to France, agrees with Commines that Louis XI oppressed and tyrannized over his people more than any of his predecessors because he had set taxes and impositions upon the Commons without the "assent of the Three Estates which is like to the courte of the parlement in Ingelonde." "So the people are impoverished and wasted. They drink water and eat apples with very brown bread made of rye. They eat no flesh except the entrails and heads of beasts killed for the nobles and merchants. They wear no wool but a poor coat of coarse canvas called a frock. Their stockings of the same canvas come below the knee and their legs are bare. Their wifes and children go barefoot. . . . Verily they live in the most extreme poverty and miserie and yet they dwell in the most fertile realm of the world."

Louis XI was a most capable king, with a passion for work, but, in spite of the fact that he brought the kingship triumphantly through terrible dangers, no one has thought of calling him great; for he was lacking in large ideas and he was as free from generous impulses as a spider patiently waiting for blundering flies to entangle themselves in the web he has woven. Many feared him, some respected him, the burghers were mildly grateful to him, but, so far as we know, no man or woman loved him. Even Commines, who says that of all the many princes he has known, none seemed to him "less faulty in the main," has for him no affection. The last year of his life, Louis XI lived shut up in a strong castle whose guards had orders to shoot at any one who approached the walls. He grew jealous of everybody and even afraid of his son-in-law, his daughter and his own son, for, in the end, the fear he had inspired mastered his own heart.

That we know his character so well is due to the vivid memoirs of Philip de Commines; who had been a chief councillor of the Duke of Burgundy and became the closest councillor of Louis XI. Commines is the fourth of a succession of brilliant writers of memoirs in French who died at intervals of almost exactly one hundred years. Geoffrey de Villehardouin, who died in 1212, was one of the weightiest councillors of the third crusade and he has left an account of it which some critics think the first history written in a European vernacular which can be called a work of literary art. It gives us a series of realistic pictures of the chivalry sung by the poets, as it actually appeared in the actions, sentiments and characters of the men who at the height of its power felt the influence of its ideals.

Jean, Sire de Joinville, Seneschal of Champagne, who died in 1319, has left us a portrait of the mediæval king whose portrait was best worth preserving, Saint Louis, and adorned his pages with miniatures in words as

brilliant as those we find in the manuscripts of his day.

Jean Froissart, who died in 1410, was a village curé, a poet and a traveller, who visited The Netherlands, all of France, Italy, England and Scotland, everywhere mingling in courtly society and meeting distinguished men. Out of what they told him of events in which they had taken part, he wrote a chronicle recounting the outstanding picturesque episodes of his times. Without possessing any profundity or attempting to be complete, he produced perhaps the most graphic account of any age written before or since; filled with a great number of striking portraits. The accuracy of his history is not impaired by the fact that it has about it a certain romantic and theatrical air; for that was the native air of the people whom he described and for whom he wrote.

Philip de Commines, Lord of Argenton, Chamberlain of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy and afterwards Chamberlain and Councillor of Louis XI, King of France, died in 1511. Forty years later the great German historian Sleidan wrote: "He has written the History of Louis XI and his son Charles VIII in French and done it so well that he ought to be imitated by any man who expects to gain credit by writing history." He has been called the father of modern history; though all of these four writers have the marks of greatness which make the book which possesses them seem always modern and they are widely read with pleasure to-day. Their lives span three hundred and fifty years and give a base for the development of one of the most beautiful creations of man —that French prose which is the clearest medium for the expression of thought and feeling since the days of Greece and Rome. This heritage, whose accumulation was begun by very remote ancestors is now so widely diffused that it seems to be difficult for any Frenchman to write a book, and especially a book on history, which is not at least clear.

The heir of Louis XI, Charles VIII, acceded to the throne in his fourteenth year. He was to grow into a man very different from his father, but his sister Anne, in her twenty-fourth year, was a chip of the old block. She draws her own picture in her directions to her daughter Suzanne. "Always maintain a dignified bearing, a cold and confident manner, a humble look and low speech and be always steadfast and firm in your intent without bending." Anne and her husband, a cadet of the princely house of Bourbon, twice her age, had been put in charge of the young King by his dying father. They could not carry out entirely his instructions to maintain in power the old officers and ministers. Three of the tools for the most hate inspiring acts of Louis XI were men of very lowly origin. Olivier le Daim, the King's barber surgeon, and two of his helpers, were at once arrested by the princes of the blood and secretly tried. Two were hung; the third had his ears cut off and his tongue bored through. Among the things charged against Olivier was the following crime. A certain gentleman was put in prison by the King. Olivier told his pretty wife he would secure his release if she would sacrifice her honour. The frantic woman consented and the next day Olivier and his servant tied her husband in a sack and threw him into the Seine.

In spite of the hatred and ambition of the princes of the blood, Anne and her husband managed to maintain the controlling influence in the government for nearly ten years and to marry the young king to the heiress of the last great independent Duchy—Brittany. The marriage agreement was that, if Charles VIII died without a son, Anne of Brittany could not marry any one but his successor or the heir apparent to the French throne.

During the early days of the struggle of the brother-in-law and sister of the King at the head of the old councillors of Louis XI, against the Dukes of Orleans and

Bourbon, over the right to fill the small royal council, both sides agreed to consult the Estates General. So in January 1484, the first complete Estates General of France, representing all the provinces except Brittany, met at Tours. They refused to take the responsibility of constituting the royal council, presented a long list of grievances and asked for a reduction of taxes to about a third of what was collected under Louis XI. When this was agreed to by the King, the orator for the clergy said that in reducing taxes at their request, the King had not acted out of generosity but out of justice. He asserted that the Estates made their offer of subsidy only on condition that they should be called again in two years, for the Estates "do not intend that henceforth any money shall be raised without their wish and consent." The Chancellor agreed in the name of the King and the first complete Estates General of France were politely forced to separate after a session of two months. Their assertion of rights was not of much practical effect for no similar assembly was convened for seventy-six years.

PERIOD 7

THE GREAT UPHEAVAL OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

A. Why France Was Not the Leader of the Renascence.
B. The Dream of Italian Conquest and the Duel between Habsburg and Valois (1494–1559).
C. The Renascence in France. The Early French Reformers.
D. The Spread of the Calvinist Church.
E. The Huguenot Wars to the Peace of St. Germain (1562–1570).
F. The French Country Gentry and the Huguenot Armies. The Royal Marriage to Seal Peace.
G. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The New Huguenot Leader.
H. The League of the Holy Trinity. Henry IV Saves France.
I. Literature in the Sixteenth Century.

Chapters XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI.

CHAPTER XXIV

WHY FRANCE WAS NOT THE LEADER OF THE RENASCENCE. THE OBSESSION OF ITALIAN CONQUEST. THE DYNASTIC DUEL

When Charles VIII at the age of twenty-two put aside the advice of his sister and brother-in-law and began to rule for himself, the world was at the beginning of changes more rapid and striking than any that had taken place for centuries. It is necessary to go back a thousand years to the barbarian invasions to find anything comparable to the changes caused in western Europe by the intellectual, moral and religious movements which we designate by the terms Renascence and Reformation.

In neither of these movements did France play the preponderant part. For the position of leadership in the realm of art, letters and learning which she held in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was lost in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. "France had shared with Italy the privilege of having, since the middle ages, a refined culture. It is incontestable that afterwards she allowed herself to be surpassed by her rival. Neither in the plastic arts nor in literature could France match the illustrious ultra montane names by names of equal weight." [Brunot.]

Italy took the lead of mankind in expressing human thought and feeling in new forms of power and beauty. Dante, greatest poet since Virgil died twelve hundred years before, was born in Florence in the end of the thirteenth century, first of a line of artists and writers who in a few generations put the little city on the Arno alongside the little city of Athens as the mother of men whose work has become part of the lasting inheritance of

all ages. His younger fellow townsman, Petrarch, became the forerunner of the impulse of the *new learning,* born of the genius of Italy which, with the help of renewed study of the inheritance from the classic world, broke away from the outworn forms and methods of scholasticism, and led Europe on new paths toward new triumphs of science, of imagination, of creative skill in the plastic arts. This movement, which finally crossed the Alps and spread from the Mediterranean to the North and Baltic Seas, did not at first find powerful carriers in France, for it was not until the middle of the fifteenth century, that the works or even the names of Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio begin to appear in France.

On the other hand, the Reformation, although it rapidly developed a characteristic French form, got in Germany its first powerful impulse which focussed the attention of the world. From Germany, too, came the invention of the printing press which furnished to the Renascence, to the Protestant Reformation, and to the Catholic Counter Reformation, the means of carrying on under modern conditions, their great discussion of two centuries.

The attempt to show just why things did not happen differently from the way they did happen, is usually as futile as it is amusing, but it may be suggested that the reason France lost, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the spiritual leadership of the world, which was hers in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, was probably the misery of the dragging Anglo-Burgundian wars, followed, after a brief interval, by the Franco-Burgundian conflict of Louis XI, with its retinue of devastation and heavy taxation.

The Franco-Burgundian War was only a step in the narrow, crafty, but powerfully persistent policy of Louis XI, which centralized France in the crown. To millions of Frenchmen, patriotism was loyalty and loyalty patriotism. The right of consent to taxation, that touchstone

of freedom, was indeed theoretically claimed by writers on politics. But such assertions were only abstract formulas of sound words. This is proved not only by the fact that the Estates General did not meet, but also by the observations of competent foreign observers. The English Fortescue wrote in 1470 that the French King "set taxes upon the commons without the assent of the Three Estates." Macchiavelli, who visited France forty years later, wrote: "The French people are submissive and hold their kings in great veneration. I have asked a great many people and they have all replied that the revenue of the crown depended entirely upon the will of the King." Thirty years later a Venetian Ambassador reports, "The present King can boast of far surpassing all his predecessors, as well in making his subjects pay extraordinary taxes to any amount he wishes, etc."

The four kings of France who succeeded Louis XI had a control more unlimited than that of any other ruler of their day over a large, fertile and populous territory, not, indeed, quite equivalent to modern France, but extending in a compact mass between Germany and Spain from the Mediterranean to the English Channel and from the Alps to the Atlantic. Three of these four powerful sovereigns became obsessed by the idea of trying to make and hold conquests across the Alps.

Charles VIII the son of Louis XI had been a delicate, badly educated child, and he was not either physically or mentally well equipped for kingship. He was incapable of steady work, but easily led astray by grandiose and dramatic dreams in whose realization he always saw himself in imagination holding the centre of the stage. He had the obstinacy of a weak personality, but his laziness made him easily managed by those who flattered his vague hopes of playing a great part in the world. Italy at the end of the fifteenth century lacked not only a national ideal or any centre for it, but even the consciousness of

any solidarity of interest. Among the jealous and shifting states into which it was divided, Charles VIII, alleging a claim more than doubtful to the heritance of the Kingdom of Naples, marched the whole length of the peninsula with so little resistance that it was jestingly said the only weapons he needed were the pieces of chalk used by his commissaries to mark the doors of the houses where his troops were quartered at night. He conquered Naples with small effort, but, hearing that the states of northern Italy were leagued to block his return, marched rapidly back, cut his way through the Italian army and recrossed the Alps with the loss of some of his baggage. Within a year the troops he left in Naples were overwhelmed and the ephemeral conquest lost. When he died the only result of his foreign policy was a secret treaty with Spain to divide Italy.

His cousin and successor, Louis XII, was a much superior man, who had a sense of duty to his people and felt the pathos in the short and simple annals of the poor. But he too was obsessed by the Italian dream, and had himself crowned Duke of Milan. He took the Duchy as easily as Charles had conquered Naples and made a second partition treaty with Spain for the Kingdom of Naples. But after a French army had conquered Naples, Spain and France quarrelled over the spoil, and, in 1504 the French were driven out. Henceforth Spain in Naples and France in the north, made Italy their fighting ground —or rather the royal houses who wore the crowns of those two countries made Italy the fighting ground of their family ambition. It was this situation Pietro Aretino had in mind when he wrote his friend, Giovanni dei Medici to get healed of his wound in order that he might take the field and "make of Italy, now a slave, a queen."

The Italian wars, which lasted intermittently for thirteen years longer, were a dull series of inconclusive campaigns, against a still duller background of chicanery in

crafty and pompous diplomatic negotiations. The war produced for France only one great general, Gaston de Foix, a nephew of Louis XII who, at the age of twenty-three, fell at his great victory of Ravenna, pierced by eighteen wounds.

In the field of diplomacy it is impossible to see any consistent plan or any strong personality except Pope Julius II, who in conversation with Michelangelo about a statue, said: "Don't put a book in my hand. Give me a sword." The fierce pope first united three-fourths of Europe against Venice and, when he had humiliated the proud Republic, he turned against France. Uniting Spain, the Empire, England and the Netherlands he drove her out of Italy. Marriage diplomacy broke this league also and the fifty-two year old King of France married the pretty eighteen year old sister of Henry VIII. Even his marriage could not divert him from the idea which had always obsessed him "I will reconquer Italy in the spring" he said, but in the midst of winter he died.

His home policy was as markedly successful as his foreign policy was futile. In 1506 he assembled what is sometimes called an Estates General, although it was not elected but composed of members summoned by the King. The orator of the Estates, instead of presenting as usual a long list of complaints, recited a list of benefits the nation had received from the King "for which causes and others, too numerous to recite, the King should be called Louis XII, Father of his People." The name lasted. Two generations later the true Estates General of Orleans repeated it and all through the sixteenth century people looked back to his reign as to a golden age of prosperity.

These Italian wars were brought to a conclusion, as brilliant as a display of fireworks, by Francis I, who succeeded his cousin, the son-less Louis XII. Francis I inherited not only the crown of France, but what has been called the "haunting obsession" of Italy. Within seven

months of mounting the throne, he was leading an army across narrow passes of the Alps where the rocks had to be blasted to make way for his 150 cannon. Attacked in the plains of Italy by the Swiss fighting for the Pope, he beat those hitherto invincible troops in a two-days' fight, so fierce, that one of his generals said none of the other eighteen pitched battles of his life had been more than child's play in comparison. (1515.) After this victory, which gave him an enormous military reputation, he made a series of treaties. A concordat with the Pope divided the patronage of the French Church between the papacy and the crown. He formed with the Swiss the "perpetual peace" which was a defensive alliance. The same year, he made peace with Spain. A general treaty of reciprocal protection, was signed by the Emperor and the Kings of Spain and France. The series of Italian wars, begun a quarter of a century before, was closed.

But a new series of general wars soon began. These wars were partly the outcome of political fear entirely natural under the circumstances. But causes equally evident were the greed of dynasties and the bitter hatred of rival sovereigns; backed by a nobility to whom war was the most interesting game in the world. In 1516 three young sovereigns divided the bulk of the wealth and military force of Europe. Charles I, King of Spain, was sixteen years old, Francis I at twenty-two years was King of France and Henry VIII, twenty-five years old, was King of England. The rivalry of these three men involved Europe in intermittent war for nearly forty years.

The rivalry began, not in arms, but by a struggle for the elective office of Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation. In 1519 the Emperor Maximilian died and the two chief kings in Europe wanted his chair, while Henry VIII of England had a vague hope of getting in by a deadlock. Seven German potentates, three

of them archbishops, the rest secular princes, had the right to elect the Emperor. The young rivals were ready to buy votes; and six of the seven were for sale. Charles spent huge sums and won; though not entirely by his money.

No man since Charlemagne had ruled so much of Europe as Charles V. He inherited from his father and both his grandparents, the Netherlands—the Spanish Kingdoms, Naples and Sicily, the Habsburg inheritance of the Duchy of Austria with related lands and the new lands enriched by the mines of Mexico and South America. All this power he intended to use to support his authority as Emperor.

In 1524 Francis, who could not get Italy out of his mind, crossed the Alps with a powerful army to conquer the Duchy of Milan. At Pavia, he was attacked by the Imperial army, defeated with great slaughter, wounded and taken prisoner. In the battle he played the part of a brave soldier but a poor general, for he showed the same sort of bull-headed courage which had been so fatal to the French chivalry in the wars of the previous century. The disaster was complete and he wrote to his mother that "nothing was left to him except his honour and his life."

He was taken to Spain but it was nearly a year before he could be brought to sign the treaty of Madrid, by which he surrendered the large and rich province of Burgundy, renounced the sovereignty of Flanders and Artois, gave up all his claims in Italy and agreed to marry the sister of Charles V. His jailer made him swear to this treaty upon his honour as a king and a knight and by his faith as a Christian. But Francis never intended to keep it and a couple of hours before confirming it, he had declared secretly to his gentlemen that he considered his oath null and void. The Treaty of Madrid was therefore immediately broken.

A dragging intermittent war of 37 years followed. The opening years of it are illuminated by the heroic figure of Bayard, the *Chevalier sans peur et sans reproche;* the long story has episodes which give dash and colour to drum and trumpet history, but a condensed account of it is appallingly dull. The largest motive in it is the not unnatural fear of the great power inherited by the Emperor Charles V, and fear, which underlies the fully developed balance of power idea, is not a very inspiring motive for human action. The long struggle between the houses of Habsburg and Valois, with the King of England shifting from one to the other to make his profit out of both, the Swiss selling the blood of their youth wholesale to France, and the German mercenaries selling theirs retail to the highest bidders, seems at this distance a dark and meaningless spectacle. It is a succession of slaughterous battles of which the victors made no use, and of inefficient invasions repelled by disease and starvation. The most constant element in it is the rapine and cruelty which the habits, and even the rules of war, sanctioned. It included the sack of Rome (1527) by Spanish and German troops; perhaps the worst devils' carnival in the entire history of lust and greed. The most notable outcome of this struggle was hate. This began with the leaders, for Charles V publicly denounced Francis I as a perjurer without honour and challenged him to a duel, and Charles V was openly accused by Francis I of poisoning the heir to the throne of France. This hate spread to the peoples, for first the French and then the Spaniards were detested in Italy, while Spaniards and Germans made themselves detestable in France.

It is generally agreed among most modern historians that none of the four French kings engaged in these two related and yet distinct series of wars, the Italian wars (1494–1518) and the Habsburg-Valois wars (1521–1559), showed marked or solid ability in their business of

kingship. All were obeyed because of reverence for their sacred office, but only Louis XII won affectionate remembrance from his people, and only Francis I has won any admiration: from historians of art and from writers who look only on the battlefield to find the "glory of France."

Among these four kings, many historians have presented Henry II as the dullest and weakest—a sort of crowned moron. Some of these expressions of contempt are rather amusingly based on the fact that, for more than twenty years, he went every day to see his mistress; a woman ten years older than himself. But, even in the case of a king, the choice of mistresses belongs to that realm of personal taste in which, from very ancient times, discussion has been considered unprofitable. Some things indicate that Henry II showed toward the family fight with the Habsburgs, rather more hard sense than his three predecessors. His most trusted councillor was strongly in favour of closing the struggle as soon as possible. Besides Henry II wanted to fight, not in Italy, but on the northern border among a friendly population where any gains made would round out natural boundaries. It was not by accident that the only important permanent gains of territory made by France during these two series of wars were made by Henry II: Boulogne, Calais, retaken from the English, Metz, Toul and Verdun added to France in the northeastern corner.

Toward the end of his reign he was led by a cabal made up of his mistress, his wife and the Duke of Guise to renew the war and send an army across the Alps. For, while he was no fool, he had the not uncommon combination of obstinacy with weakness and was too easily led. The transalpine expedition was a failure and its leader the Duke of Guise was called home from the discredit of the complete breakdown of all his strategy, military and diplomatic, by a note from his superior officer the Constable. When he arrived in France he was greeted by a

poet as "the greatest leader of the French—the only man who can raise the fallen fortunes of France."

For during his journey a great disaster had befallen the realm. While a large part of the forces of France was south of the Alps, Spaniards, English and Germans had invaded northern France with what was then the huge army of 50,000 men. The newly won city of Metz stood out heroically against the invaders. The Constable having with difficulty gathered 20,000 men advanced to throw reinforcements and provisions into the city. Marching carelessly, he was trapped at St. Quentin and forced into a pitched battle which he had never intended to fight. His army was annihilated and all the French officers of higher rank, north of the Alps, were taken prisoner. The visitors dared not advance on Paris for King Philip II feared lest, like his father Charles V, "he might march into France eating peacocks and march out eating turnips."

Guise raised the morale of France by taking Calais in the depth of winter according to a plan made by the King, who, from the beginning of his reign, had been possessed with the idea of reconquering Calais. The English had held Calais for two hundred and twelve years and they had cut into one of its gateways this inscription: "The French will take Calais when iron floats like cork." Its capture seemed to all France a balance for the humiliation of St. Quentin.

The two kings were completely exhausted by the long family struggle their fathers had begun. Henry wrote to the Constable who was conducting negotiations: "Do whatever you can to give us peace." Philip wrote to his commissioner: "I find myself under an absolute impossibility of continuing the war." The result of this situation was the peace of Cateau Cambrésis (1559) which remained the base of the public law of Europe until the peace of Westphalia in 1648. For, as a contemporary

historian points out [de Thou] it "included the Pope, the Emperor, the Kings of Poland, Sweden, Denmark and Scotland, the Republics of Venice, Switzerland, Genoa and Lucca and the Duchies of Lorraine, Savoy, Ferrara, Mantua, Urbino, Parma and Piacenza; so that it was not a peace between the French and Spaniards, but between all Christian princes."

The bulk of the warrior class, and that meant the greater part of the nobility, regarded this treaty as a disgrace to France. Marshal Brissac, a veteran of the Habsburg-Valois wars, who had held victoriously the French conquest of Piedmont, exclaimed in despair "Oh miserable France, to what loss and ruin hast thou submitted; thou who wast triumphant over all the nations of Europe." But the treaty of Cateau Cambrésis brought France three solid advantages to balance the hurt professional pride of her fighting men. The first was a needed peace required by a financial position close to bankruptcy. The second was freedom from "the chimera of Italian conquest." The third was that it brought her permanent defenses where they were most needed against aggressions from her neighbours: Calais against England, Metz against Germany, were "bulwarks of incalculable value," worth far more than Piedmont. For as a contemporary wrote: "Italy was never any use to us French except to furnish us graves when we invaded it."

The greatest French poet of the century Ronsard sang to his King over the truce (Vaucelles) which preceded the treaty:

"Thou hast destroyed the troubles
Of harmful war,
Flashing on us the splendour
Of thy victorious graces,
Instead of the harsh iron,
Threats and flames,
Thou bringest to us sports,
Dance and the love of women;

Labours dear and pleasant,
To young and ardent years,
Oh great King without an equal,
Thou givest us this gift
Because of Montmorency
And his faithful counsel."

The Ambassador of Venice reported in a letter, "At Paris and in all other cities, this peace was received with demonstrations of universal joy."

The end of the long dynastic struggle was celebrated by two marriages; the restored Duke of Savoy took for his duchess the sister of Henry II; and the King of Spain took for his second queen the oldest unmarried daughter of Henry II. In a tournament which was part of the celebration of this double marriage, the King, who had all his father's skill in the use of arms, was wounded in the head by the broken lance of the captain of his scottish guards and died some days afterward at the age of forty.

CHAPTER XXV

THE RENASCENCE IN FRANCE. THE EARLY FRENCH REFORMERS

The death of Henry II in his prime was hailed by some of his subjects with the solemn joy with which a Hebrew prophet hailed the death of an open enemy of God. An old courtier, who had known his widow well in her early married life, wrote to her: "God, deeply angered and offended, permitted the King to fall into hardness of heart so far as to make himself a complete enemy of His holy word . . . but He has been pleased to show that He knows well how to avenge Himself because He brought the King to death by the blow of a lance."

In order to understand this letter we must go back and trace the history of a movement among the French people which began with the reign of Francis I and spread in spite of great efforts on his part and that of his son to repress it. This movement was only part of a general convulsion of European thought and society known to historians by the name of the Reformation. There were three main causes for this huge convulsion which brought about civil war in Switzerland, Germany, England, France, the Netherlands and finally in the seventeenth century produced the Thirty Years War when all Europe gathered to fight on the soil of Germany. The first main cause was the perception, very wide spread among active minded men, of the deep corruption of ecclesiastical institutions; a second main cause was the intellectual movement of the Renascence; and a third was the advance in the process of the formation of national feeling or patriotism.

The deep seated corruption of the Church is asserted or illustrated in a great deal of the writing of the first two generations of the sixteenth century. The most conclusive evidence about its existence and its influence in producing heresy and schism is to be found in the books, letters and sermons of men who were loyal members of the ancient church. Soon after the death of Henry II the orthodox court poet, Ronsard, wrote: "If St. Paul should come back, what would he say of our young prelates who pay no attention to their flocks except to shear and sometimes even to skin them. They toil not, nor preach, nor pray. They do not even set a good example for they are perfumed hangers on at court, lovers, gallants, hunters and gamesters who waste with bad women the property of God which they are set to guard." A little earlier (1555), the poet Joachim du Bellay, towards the end of a three years' residence in Rome as major-domo of a cardinal's household, wrote the following sonnet on the death of Pope Marcellus II, elected April 9th and dead before the end of the month.

"As one who wishes to cleanse some foul sewer often remains buried in the deep filth because he has not worn a mask against suffocation by the great stink, so the good Pope Marcellus, having lifted the sluice gate for the outflow of the filthy depths of the accumulated vices with which his predecessor had for six years been poisoning the world, the poor man was taken unaware by such an effluvium that he fell dead in the midst of the work without having half cleaned up the filth."

But the fact of corruption, though it might perhaps have finally provoked reforms, would not of itself have produced the split between northern and southern Christianity. To do that two other forces cooperated. One of these was the Renascence, a general broadening and quickening of the human spirit forming new judgments and finding new sources of pleasure and new methods of ex-

pression of which the rebirth of classic art and literature was only a part.

The effect of the Renascence can be most easily traced in the history of art. But its central movement was the spread of a new theory of education, which gradually brought in a new way of looking at life. The life and writings of Petrarch (died 1374) first markedly fostered in Italy a movement in favour of a *new learning* defended by a class of men who called themselves Humanists, as opposed to the *old learning* of the Scholastics, who were apt to resist every suggested change in the substance or methods of instruction. One strong desire of the Humanists was to restore the knowledge of Greek which at the birth of Petrarch was known to very few west of the Adriatic. Another was to get back to the original texts of the great classic literatures, discarding the mediæval comments. They defended the rights of criticism against tradition, and of the individual judgment against authority in scholarship.

Italian Humanism, which rapidly found patrons among the merchants, nobles and princes of Italy, did not, during the first generation, concern itself much with religion. But when the *new learning* came across the Alps in the end of the fifteenth century, the Humanists of France, Spain, England, Switzerland and Germany began to use, in the sphere of religion, that refusal to accept the mere assertion of traditional authority which had characterized the work of the Italian Humanists in classic literature. They preached reform, but an educational reform; without violence and proceeding from the top downward. The northern Humanists had it pretty much their own way, because the advocates of the *old learning* were no match for them in debate. Men like Reuchlin, Ximenes, Erasmus, Budé, Lefevre and More threatened to sweep the field, and it looked as if they might succeed in bringing about a peaceful reform. But their triumph was only in

words, and the actual condition of the Church was not visibly affected.

So when the younger generation of transalpine Humanists led by men like Tyndale, Farel, Zwingli, Luther and Calvin took the road that led, not to reform but to heresy and schism, the older generation of Humanists turned the sword of controversy against disciples more radical than they. But nevertheless it was the new intellectual attitude bred by the *new learning,* the tools of investigation and the weapons for discussion furnished by the *new learning,* the existence among the burghers, the clergy and the nobles of western Europe of an audience whose minds had been opened by the *new learning,* which made ready for this greatest controversy that has ever shaken the European world. For in many countries the younger generation passed beyond reform and declared for revolution. They wished to destroy the universal Church saying her prayers in the universal language and to substitute for her a series of national churches, each independent of the other, and each saying her prayers in her own vernacular.

At the end of the fifteenth century French letters were passing through a period of comparative barrenness, and her arts, in spite of men of original genius like Colombe and Fouquet, were largely dominated by Flemish influence. Architecture, the most native and independent of all, was passing through a stage of development which some modern critics call decadent. In the middle of the sixteenth century France completed a slow change in her artistic methods and ideals by which she then made almost suddenly a break with her own artistic past, and followed, on new roads, new ideas and ideals. The guiding element in the great change in French art which occurred in the sixteenth century was the influence of classic art. But this influence did not reach French artists directly. It was transmitted to them through Italy. France during the

various stages of her development, has been noticeably free from xenophobia. From the beginning of full national life in the fifteenth century on, she has welcomed strangers. Louis XI (1461–1483) encouraged foreigners, Italians, Spaniards, Flemings, Scots, Lorrainers, Piedmontese, Savoyards, Germans, Swiss to make homes in France. In later centuries, the French developed marked ability, not only to turn, for instance, a Scotch family into a French family, but to attract, welcome and assimilate whole masses of bordering populations. With all the intensity of their patriotism—so intense as sometimes to appear narrow to superficial observers—they have never adopted the idea that in order to be "one hundred per cent" French, a man must be ready to lay an embargo on all ideas and impulses which come from without. On the contrary "it has always been one of the glories of France that she is ever ready to welcome new ideas, whether they spring from her own soil or not." [Tilley.] It was in accord with this natural liberal bent that the Renascence finally wrought after the lapse of two generations, striking changes in French learning, letters and art.

Scattered traces of the influence of Italian Humanism are to be observed in French history in the early years of the fifteenth century, but these germs do not seem to have been strong. War, anarchy and misery it is true repressed their growth, but aside from that, they did not, at that time, take deep or broad root for a vigorous life. When Charles VIII led his army across the Alps in 1494 the influence of Italian arts and letters was no stronger in France than it had been under his grandfather fifty years before. During that invasion Charles VIII collected a large amount of artistic plunder. Much of this was lost on his retreat, when he cut his way through the Italian forces at Fornovo leaving behind a great part of his baggage. The heavier pieces, sent by sea, were captured by

the Genoese. But in spite of these losses, he brought back into France 8,700 pounds of manuscripts, tapestries, pictures and marbles, and all of his army who had eyes to see brought back unforgetable images of the glories of Italian art in palaces, villas, bronzes, furniture, pictures and the small arts.

From that time on, Italian influence in art and letters spread in France and the conquered began to conquer their conquerors. Italian influence meant in 1500 the influence of classic antiquity, but Italy was not simply a transmitter of an art which was the result of mere imitation. No one would mistake the work of an Italian artist of the end of the fifteenth century for the work of a gothic artist, but neither would anyone mistake an Italian work of the fifteenth century for a work of classic art. Often they frankly mingled elements from mediæval and classic art. The *Certosa di Pavia* for instance built in the last half of the fifteenth century, which seemed to Commines "the finest church he had even seen," displayed, in the rich decoration of its façade, Hercules among the prophets, the Virgin Mary and mythological heroes, cupids and angels, saints and Roman emperors.

What the Italians had done with the revived classic influence, the French did with that influence transmitted to them in an Italianized form. They mingled it with their own art; at first in the shape of decoration. This process is evident in the work of a small colony of twenty-one artists and artisans brought by Charles VIII from Italy and settled at Amboise. Not simply by their example, but for other reasons, the new fashion spread slowly during the twenty years following the return of Charles VIII. A considerable number of châteaux and city houses were built by great nobles or rich royal officials, in which a traditional gothic plan is more or less touched by decoration in the new style; medallions of emperors, egg and dart moulding, colonnettes of the classic orders, etc. At the

death of Louis XII the architecture of the Renascence in Italian form had taken such firm root in France that in 1512 the preface of a translation of an Italian work on architecture, said: "Since Charles VIII returned as a glorious conqueror from Naples, the art of building in the beautiful Doric and Ionic style, which is also that of Italy, has begun to be practised among us with great success. At Amboise, Gaillon, Tours, Blois, Paris and a hundred other places, you may now see buildings built in a classical style."

But the writer exaggerated for, at that time, the new style of building was confined to a limited part of France. During the reign of Francis I (1515–1547) under the intelligent and vigorous backing given by the King to the new elements, a real struggle for the mastery of French art seems to have taken place between the native mediæval tradition and the foreign influence of the Renascence.

The best side of Francis I was his genuine love of beauty in art and his liking for learned men. He spent on arts and letters a not inconsiderable part of the streams of gold which his mania for extravagance caused to flow through his fingers, like the water of some renascence fountain running through the hands of a bronze nymph. Francis was a great lover of Italy, where he had met glorious victory and humiliating defeat. He invited an Italian across the Alps to be the tutor for his sons. He formed a strong friendship for Leonardo da Vinci, brought him to France with a handsome pension and took great delight in the conversation of that versatile genius. He brought Benvenuto Cellini to Paris to work gold and silver and cast bronze for him. When he wished to make a house for himself out of an old château of St. Louis at Fontainebleau, a project on which he spent twenty years, he brought Primaticcio, and other Italians less known, to decorate the interior. Five or six Italian engravers settled in France and broadcast the frescoes of the King's

new château which were copied by all the seigneurs, great or small, who built new châteaux or manor houses.

One of these frescoes was thus described not long after it was painted. "In this picture, which is symbolic, there are several men and women with their eyes bandaged who seem to be trying to go towards a temple in which is King Francis with a crown of laurel on his head. He makes evident his wish to open the door of the temple to lead into it the blinded men and women: which symbolizes the care that illustrious monarch took to drive out the blindness of ignorance of those days and to give entry into the temple of the muses in order to cultivate the sciences and the arts."

From the sumptuary arts of tapestry, enamels, cabinet making, the goldsmiths and jewelers' art, to painting and statuary, all branches of French artistic effort show, during the first half of the sixteenth century the same mixture of influences, the same struggle between native mediæval tradition and a neo-classicism transmitted through Italy. Before the death of the son of Francis I (1560) the new influence had won a complete triumph. This triumph was much aided—it may not be exaggerated to say led—by five great architects who all began their careers in the early fifteen forties, a few years before the death of Francis I; du Cerceau, de l'Orme, Bullant, Lescot and Goujon. We know that the first three had studied in Italy and it is probable that Lescot and Goujon had visited the artistic treasures across the Alps.

These men brought it to pass that during the reign of Henry II (1547–1559) there became prevalent in France a "new type of architecture guided by standards so broad and elastic that they sufficed with but comparatively slight adjustment for the expression of French ideas for nearly three hundred years. . . . Certain of the buildings of this time might with slight modifications have been the product of almost any period from 1540 to 1870, while every

reign from Henry II to Napoleon III has produced work, which but for minutiæ might have been built when Henry II was king."

This new architecture, so different from the gothic which France had given to the world in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, was no mere servile imitation of something imported from abroad. It was not even an exotic planted in French soil and laboriously brought to a forced growth. The genius of France adopted and molded what came to her from abroad, and France gave to the French Renascence "the visible impress of her own spirit." The buildings of the Italian Renascence are not more different from the buildings of classic antiquity, than a château of the valley of the Loire is different from a château on the banks of the Brenta. Not even the dullest observer could confuse the palace of the Louvre with the palaces of the Medici or the Rucellai in Florence.

This new style, French, in spite of the classic and Italian elements molded into it, was not, like the gothic of the Isle de France, the more or less unconscious development of an artistic impulse not formulated in theory. It was an intentional and deliberate creation whose principles and methods were explained in many architectural books, of which the most striking were written by some of the great architects named. What they wished to do and did, was quite similar to what a company of friends did at the same time for French poetry: abandon its ancient forms and, by new methods and using new materials, give it a new direction; a direction which French literature was to follow for centuries. Their programme for the French language and for French poetry, will perhaps symbolically explain what the artists of France in the middle of the sixteenth century did for the French plastic arts.

Two years after the death of Francis I (1549) there appeared a little book of 20,000 words which has been called "the first work of literary criticism in French which

counts and the most worthy of consideration of any that appeared for a hundred and twenty-five years afterward."* It is entitled *The Defense of the French Language and How to Confer Lustre upon It.* It was written by a poet of twenty-seven, Joachim du Bellay who shortly afterwards became one of a band of litterateurs who called themselves the Pleiad in imitation of a similar band of poets at Alexandria in the third century before Christ. Du Bellay's work was the standard around which they rallied under the lead of Pierre Ronsard, the ablest of them. In the first book du Bellay says he cannot "blame enough the stupid ignorance and temerity of some of our nation who although they are nothing less than good Grecians or Latinists, despise and frown upon everything in French and think our vernacular incapable of expressing good literature or sound learning." He rejects with indignation the application of the term "barbarous" to French, points out that though richer than some suppose, it is not so rich as Greek or Latin; explains how the ancient Romans enriched their tongue and asserts the possibility of giving new lustre to the French vernacular. The method of doing this he sets forth in the second book which begins with the assumption "which we have, it seems to me, sufficiently proved in the first book, that without imitating the Greeks and Romans we cannot give to our language the excellence and the light of other more famous tongues." He recommends the abandonment of all the old complicated rhythms of French poetry and the adoption of the metres of Ovid, Virgil, Theocritus, Horace, Martial to whom he adds the names of two Italians Petrach and Sannazaro; for he, and the whole Pleiad, took as much from Italian as from classic literature.

The school did not content themselves with vague principles but indicated precise methods for making French more rich and polished, *e. g.,* 1. Borrowing terms from

* Lanson.

the classic tongues; for instance, du Bellay brought into use the word "patrie." 2. Restoring obsolete words to use. 3. Employing in poetry good words of dialect. 4. Talking with all sorts of workmen in order to get the terms of their trade. 5. Propagating words on old roots, imitating consciously the natural process of the language in forming, for instance, from *impression—impressione*r —im*pressiona*ble—im*pressiona*bilité.

What the Pleiad and their followers tried to do, and largely did, to French eloquence and poetry in the latter half of the sixteenth century was done, less deliberately and consciously perhaps, by great Frenchmen in other branches of literature and in the plastic arts under the lead of architecture: they assimilated with the native artistic traditions, or the native language, classic elements more than 1,500 years old. Sometimes they went back for these elements direct to the originals, but the trend of recent French historians of art and literature is toward the conclusion that, on the whole, these new old elements came into France in the form which had been given them by the scholars, writers and artists of the Italian Renascence. At all events the French Renascence was not the importation of something foreign which the men of the sixteenth century acclimatized in France. It was rather the creation with the help of borrowed material of something, new indeed, but of something essentially French. For the French art and literature of the sixteenth century are as distinctively French as the Italian comedies or the Roman tragedies of Shakespeare are distinctively English.

The movement called the Reformation was somewhat less widespread than the Renascence, for the Reformation did not profoundly affect the history of Italy and Spain except indirectly through the European situation it created. But in all countries north of the line of the Alps and the Pyrenees it affected in a very visible manner polit-

ical history. It produced in Europe more than a hundred years of intermittent wars chiefly caused by difference of opinion about the form and practices of religion. Firmly established in France at the death of Henry II (1559) it visibly affected political history for one hundred and twenty-five years afterwards and was the chief cause of civil wars which desolated France intermittently for more than thirty years.

The intimate relation between the Renascence and the Reformation in general, has been suggested briefly. The specific relations between these two movements in France, can be indicated by the lives of two men, Guillaume Budé and Jacques Lefevre d'Etaples.

Guillaume Budé (1467–1540), the son of a wealthy burgher, studied in the universities of Paris and Orleans and in his youth was seized by the passion for knowledge which lasted throughout his life. He became an ardent and effective advocate of the *new learning.* At the solicitation of Erasmus he wrote a Greek lexicon which helped to gain him a reputation in the world of letters second only to that of Erasmus. He became the chief instigator of the plan for the foundation of a new royal college for the study of Latin, Greek and Hebrew; a combination which became a sort of trade mark of the *new learning.* This plan the King finally partly realized by the foundation of the *Collège de France;* with professorships in the three languages and mathematics. The new foundation was bitterly opposed by the advocates of the *old learning* in the University of Paris, who maintained that the study of Hebrew and Greek was in itself exceedingly dangerous and one of the best ways to propagate heresy. Budé was too strong for them and when he died (1540) one of the leading poets spoke for all of the men of learning and science of that day who counted: "Whose is this dead body followed by so great a train? Alas it is Budé in his coffin. Why do the bells not ring louder? Because his name is

widespread enough without the sound of bells. Why are there not more torches according to custom? In order that the obscurity may make plain that the light of the French has gone out." Calvin, leader of the French reform, wrote of him: "William Budé is today the first ornament and support of letters, and on her possession of him France bases her victorious claim to the palm for scholarship in the world."

Because Budé wanted the reform of the Church, because, at a time when the fundamental elements of the Renascence and the Reformation had not yet been differentiated, he fought that obscurantism of the *old learning* which was the common enemy of both, the attempt has been made to claim him for the movement of the Reformation. But what he wanted was a reform and the Reformation was a revolution. His will, written only four years before his death, declares his attachment to the doctrines of his fathers. And when militant reformers fiercely attacked doctrines dear to his heart, he did what the contemporary English Humanist, Sir Thomas More, did—forgot his liking for the individual judgment and his practice of freedom of opinion, to stoutly back savage persecution of the innovators as dangerous to church and state.

Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, much less of a scholar than Budé, was a teacher of awakening power. One of his friends wrote: "He came forth like the sun to rouse the youth of France from lethargy." As he had inherited a competency, he was able to travel. He went more than once to Germany and twice visited Italy; where he learned a devotion to the methods of the *new learning*. He cleared the universal study of Aristotle from the distortions and useless comments accumulated by scholastic teachers during many generations. On the four subjects of the regular course in arts, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, he provided better text-books. Having accom-

plished this for education he began, at the age of fifty, to turn his attention toward the study of the Bible.

In 1512, five years before Luther posted the theses which were to be the beginning of his revolt, Lefèvre published a new Latin version of the text of St. Paul's Epistles. In its preface and the accompanying commentary, he anticipated some of the conclusions Luther drew from St. Paul; the great need of reform in the Church, the authority of the Scriptures, the unmerited grace of redemption, criticism of the celibacy of the clergy and the merit of good works. Already his services to education had gained him the gratitude of Humanists all over the world, and also the suspicions of the Scholastics of the Sorbonne. But the King protected him and he published, in the teeth of the denunciations of the Sorbonne, a French translation of the New Testament.

During the captivity of the King at Madrid, Lefèvre's New Testament was condemned to be burnt and he, fearing the same fate, withdrew to Strassburg. As soon as the King got back to France he recalled Lefèvre to make him tutor to his children and librarian at the château of Blois. A few years later the King's sister Margaret, thinking that Lefèvre was again in danger, invited him to Navarre, where she reigned as queen. The pious and learned old man died six years later, safe under her protection. He was a reformer who hoped to bring about reform by persuasion and without destroying the constitution of the Church. Many of his pupils joined the militant Reformation but he was too gentle and too much absorbed in things of the mind to become a violent revolutionary.

These two men died within a few years of each other and at the same time there was born at Agen in 1540 Joseph Scaliger called by competent authority "the greatest scholar of modern times." He studied at Bordeaux, Paris and Valence and travelled in Italy, England and

Scotland. He became a Protestant but lived in France except for the last sixteen years of his life, which he spent in Holland at the University of Leiden, as what would be now called a research professor, with a handsome salary and giving no lectures. The best modern student of his life comments on his death: "the most richly stored intellect which had ever spent itself in acquiring knowledge, was in the presence of the Omniscient." [Pattison.]

CHAPTER XXVI

THE SPREAD OF THE CALVINIST CHURCH IN FRANCE

Like most of the rulers, and all the intelligent men of his day, Francis I was fully aware of the great need for the reform of the Church. In addition he was, from the very beginning of his reign, an enthusiastic and intelligent supporter of the *new learning* against the *old learning*. His beloved sister, Margaret, Queen of Navarre, was a woman of a very cultivated mind, who read Italian, Spanish, German and Latin and dabbled a little in Hebrew and a little more in Greek. Although she lacked both the technical skill and the power of imagination necessary for a great poet, she had literary skill and wrote a large mass of poetry which shows deep and strong sentiment of a noble type in connection with her two favourite subjects: love and religion.

She showed marked ability for a branch of literature in which the French have always excelled; the short prose tale taken from daily life. Her incomplete work, the *Heptameron,* a series of stories almost all based on real episodes, was suggested to her by the *Decameron* of Boccaccio. Many of them show the same strange mixture of coarseness and refinement which appears in the work of a far greater contemporary writer, Rabelais, who like Margaret was an incarnation of the early French Renascence. The superficial immodesty of the *Heptameron* accounts for its widespread popularity among successive generations of swine who have been oblivious of the pearls it contains. But the writer of these stories is not trying simply to amuse readers by a deliberate appeal to debased passion. The work has been rightly called by a great master

of French literary history: "The book of a good woman who is trying to civilize souls and refine manners."

Toward the end of her life Margaret was accused of cowardice by "The Reformers" then fighting in France and Europe for their existence. But, like all the older generation of northern Humanists, against most of whom the same accusation was brought by their former associates, she never was a "protestant." She protected scholars, and defended by all her influence those who sought to reform popular religion, but she never wanted to destroy the unity of Christendom by revolution in the Church.

Five or six years after the accession of Francis the First (1515) the series of open revolts and schisms which we call the Reformation began, all but simultaneously, under Zwingli in the Swiss city of Zurich and under Luther before the Reichstag of the German Empire. Francis was alarmed at what seemed to him no longer a conflict over ideals of education or a criticism of ecclesiastical habits, but a dangerous incitement to revolt against venerable institutions. He began therefore to allow scattered persecutions. In 1533 the Rector of the University of Paris, Nicholas Cop, delivered an inaugural address which plainly advocated the new doctrines of protest. The oration had been written for him by a student named John Calvin, and both Cop and Calvin had to leave Paris. That the persecution was not very strenuous or widespread is shown by the fact that Calvin could live quietly in the provinces.

Francis I had need, because of his conflict with the Emperor Charles V, of being on friendly terms with the Lutheran princes of Germany and the Zwinglian cantons of Switzerland; both of whom could send him soldiers. It is probable therefore that persecution would have been suspended but for the action of some of the most violent militant heretics.

A placard was printed in Switzerland by French refu-

gees attacking the mass, which was the very centre of the Catholic ritual. Copies were posted (1534) in all the streets of Paris and one was put on the door of the King's bedchamber. They called "the Pope and all his vermin of cardinals, bishops, monks and priests, sayers of masses, with all who consent thereto—false prophets, damnable deceivers, apostates, wolves, false shepherds, idolaters, seducers, liars and execrable blasphemers, murderers of souls, renouncers of Jesus Christ, false witnesses, traitors, thieves and robbers of the honour of God and more detestable than devils. . . . Were there no other error than this in your infernal theology you would deserve the stake. Light then your fires to burn yourselves; not us who refuse to believe in your idols."

The wrath of the King was great and he was lifted by it out of his half tolerant attitude: partly a liking for the *new learning* and partly a sense of political advantage. He said at a solemn ceremony of expiation: "If my arm were infected with heresy, I would cut it off." A fierce and sustained persecution broke out and John Calvin slipped across the border and began that career which made him the absentee leader of the French Reformed Church. He began it by publishing the first draft of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* His object was to set forth the system of doctrine of the French dissenters in order to defend them against slander. The increase of the executions for heresy following the placards, had brought a strong protest from those two excellent sources of mercenary troops, the Protestant cantons of Switzerland and the Protestant states of Germany. Francis explained to the protesters that these people had been put to death, not for holding what Lutherans or Zwinglians thought true, but because they were Anabaptists.

The early Anabaptists had been pitilessly persecuted by Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Zwinglians alike, not simply because they denied the validity of infant baptism,

but, largely, because they denied the right of magistrates to interfere with the liberty of conscience and worship. The idea of religious liberty seemed to everybody, Catholic or Protestant, pregnant with the destruction of all the institutions of human society, and so the first leaders of the Anabaptists, profoundly peaceful men, had been exterminated by legal process. Their place was taken by new leaders, of a highly fanatic type, who proclaimed that the time foretold by the prophets when God's elect should set up His Kingdom on earth, was come and that they were the elect. Three months before the placards were posted, the strong city of Munster on the lower Rhine was mastered by a band of these Anabaptists of the new school. They seized for common use all the property in the city, forced polygamy on the women, and recognized the claim of one of their number that God had made him King of the World. They sent out missionaries to tell people about the new kingdom of God and to advise the extermination of all the godless who refused to obey it. They maintained themselves in Munster for two years until the gates were opened by treachery and they were wiped out by troops furnished by neighbouring princes; both Protestant and Catholic.

When Calvin heard that his brethren had been called Anabaptists, he thought it would be "cowardice and treachery to lie hidden at Basle" and not come to their defence. In a preface, which is one of the great monuments of early French prose, he addressed the King: "You yourself, Sire, can be witness in regard to the great number of calumnies by which our religion is every day defamed in your presence; that is to say, that the only outcome of our doctrine will be to ruin all authority, abolish the laws, and destroy private property. . . . But you do not hear the smallest part of these calumnies. Reports are set in circulation among the people so horrible that—if they were true—the world would rightly

judge the disciples of such a doctrine worthy of a thousand gallows and a thousand stakes."*

This appeal had no effect on Francis I and his fight against the spread of the new doctrine and the new secret illegal organization, the Calvinist Church, went on. At first the Calvinists found their adherents chiefly among the smaller burghers. When fourteen stakes were set up in a circle in the market place of Meaux to burn fourteen heretics at once, the records show that the victims were all simple people, artisans and small tradesmen. But under the rule of Henry II, who continued his father's persecutions with greater zeal, the new organization began to gain adherents, at first among the smaller country gentry, the wealthier commercial classes and the so-called nobility of the robe. It was not long, however, before signs appeared that the new secret church was beginning to appeal to some of the higher nobility of France. Anthony of Bourbon, first prince of the blood, King of Navarre, was present with many of his gentlemen, in the spring of 1558, at a large assembly outside the gates of Paris held to sing the psalms in the French of Marot.

Clement Marot (1496–1543), the best poet between Villon and Ronsard, showed in his work the same mixture of mediæval and classic influences displayed in the architecture of the reign of Francis I. He was a joyous spirit doing things close to perfection in the lighter sorts of verse. For instance, this, entitled "A Love Lesson."

> "A sweet 'No! No!' with a sweet smile beneath
> Becomes an honest girl—I'd have you learn it;
> As for plain 'Yes!' it may be said, in faith,
> Too plainly and too soft—pray, well discern it!

* Calvin alludes to reports of promiscuous vice and the sacrifice of children at the Lord's Supper circulated about the Reformers. The same reports were circulated about the early Christians among the mobs of the Roman Empire and recently about Christian missionaries among mobs in China during the Boxer uprising.

Not that I'd have my pleasure incomplete,
Or lose the kiss for which my lips beset you;
But that in suffering me to take it, Sweet!
I'd have you say—'No! No! I will not let you.'"

(LEIGH HUNT.)

He became converted to the Reformed Church and made a translation of the Psalms. Although he was not gifted for the more elevated kinds of verse, his French Psalter became the song book of the Reformed; to support them when they walked to the stake and to animate them when they chanted it as they charged home on the field of battle.

Heresy continued to spread in the teeth of persecution and, during the twelve years of the reign of Henry II, France was gradually covered (much more thickly in some parts than in others) by a network of secret illegal churches. These were organized and related to each other according to a plan drafted by John Calvin, who had taken refuge in the city of Geneva and established there a seminary of theology whence he sent out his pupils as missionaries and pastors.

It must not be supposed that these new secret churches were standing for freedom of worship or even for freedom of conscience. They were standing for truth as they held it. For instance, there was a secret church at Beaugency, whose members were, of course, all in danger of the stake. One of them asserted that the magistrates had no right to punish heresy. He was called before a church meeting, which included three pastors, and his error was shown him by such "strong reasons founded on the word of God," that he signed a statement that it was the duty of magistrates to suppress obstinate heresy by force. Believing that they stood for the absolute truth, which scorned toleration as anything but a temporary expedient, and demanded the right of way as the word of God, and encouraged by the support of a considerable number

from the classes who represented the idea of authority and the profession of arms, the minds of many members of these secret churches began to turn from the earlier idea of mere passive resistance, which would make the blood of the martyrs the seed of the church. But, for some time, the thought of armed resistance to a persecuting king was strenuously opposed by their intellectual leader John Calvin.

The King, who had made the peace of Cateau Cambrésis partly in order to suppress heresy in France, felt that this new organization was increasing its powers of resistance by gaining adherents in the higher circles of society. He found it, perhaps, dangerous to attack that very free class called the nobility of the sword, which furnished officers for his army. He therefore determined to carry out repression among the nobility of the robe. It was reported to him that many of the councillors of the Parlement of Paris were so far favourable to the Reformed Church that they were trying to check by every possible means the repression of it by law. The King, accompanied by the chief functionaries of Church and State, went to a meeting of the Parlement and ordered each of the Presidents and councillors of the court to declare his opinion about the suppression of heresy. A large number gave colourless replies, a considerable number supported the stern enforcement of orthodoxy; but eight spoke so openly in defense of the Reformed or denounced so strongly customs of the ancient Church, that the King ordered their arrest. Three escaped by flight; five were committed to the Bastille. After an interrogation by a commission of ecclesiastics, the ablest and boldest of them, du Bourg, of the younger branch of a wealthy and distinguished family of Languedoc, was declared a heretic and handed over to the secular law for execution. Without concealing his opinion, he used all his legal skill in a fight for life and, in the midst of ap-

peals and counter appeals, Henry II died leaving the struggle with heresy and schism to his feeble young son Francis II.

The exact strength of the reformed churches at the death of Henry II (1559) after forty years of propaganda and persecution, cannot be accurately estimated. At first the new secret churches had made little progress outside of the humbler classes of the population. Even at that time however, it appealed to many students of the Universities and a few of the intelligentsia, because of its early close connection with Humanism and the *new learning*. But it is noticeable that, in the list of victims of the stake given in the *Book of Martyrs* for the forty years from 1515 to 1555 there are the names of only three nobles and two peasants. It is evident that there were two classes of the nation among whom the new church gained almost no adherents; the ignorant, superstitious and fanatical proletariat of the great cities and the agricultural peasants, who were the great bulk of the nation.

At the end of the reign of Henry II, large numbers of nobles of all ranks had accepted the new doctrine or joined the new organization. This was apparent to the Spanish Ambassador, who wrote: "The flower of the nation is the most spoiled. The nobility especially has taken the liberty they call evangelic." As it was finally constituted, the Reformed party had an aristocratic air: the Reformed Church was decidedly a gentleman's church.

Some things suggest that not all of these latest adherents to the new church were moved solely by religious considerations. A wave of opposition to the secular influence of the clergy had been for some time sweeping over Europe. Their wealth and their political and judicial power, had for more than a generation excited great dislike among the nobles and burghers of many countries. The same motives which made many of the nobles of

England, Scotland and Germany ready to support schism without any particular religious or intellectual interest in heresy, were operative among the nobles of France.

But, when all this has been said, it still remains true that the dominant motive among the adherents and defenders of the French Reform in the wars about religion was the religious motive. The men who, at the end of the reign of Henry II were getting ready to become the leading champions of the new doctrine and organization, did not any of them die at the stake. But there is no reason to accept as gospel the sneer of one of their fierce enemies about "Great nobles not getting themselves burnt very often for the Word of God." Almost none of them died in his bed. They fell on the battlefield, a great many of them fell by assassination, but this is very far from proving that many of them would not have gone to the stake as the country gentleman du Bourg, nephew of a Chancellor of France, finally did—if death had met them that way.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE HUGUENOTS AND THE ORTHODOX FIGHT IN THE NAME OF CHRIST

At the death of Henry II his oldest son Francis II was fifteen and a half years old: a dull, neurotic boy, immoderately devoted to violent exercise and very fond of the pretty little girl (Mary Queen of Scots and of France) who was his wife. He left the business of state so entirely in the hands of her uncles, the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine, that the Tuscan Ambassador wrote home: "The Cardinal of Lorraine is king and pope in France."

The rule of the Cardinal and the Duke immediately began to provoke great discontent. The Guise practically drove from court the leaders of the two great rival houses, Anthony of Bourbon, first prince of the blood, King of Navarre by marriage, and the Constable Montmorency, commander of the French army, the largest landed proprietor of the realm, with over six hundred fiefs and acknowledged by all the great families of the ancient nobility as "the first baron of France." Such an expulsion required a great deal of daring—their enemies called it insolence—for a family whose father had moved from Lorraine into France. The situation was not helped by the fact that the Guise had in a dozen years accumulated enormous wealth in ecclesiastical benefices, duchies and baronies bestowed on them by Henry II.

Another element of discontent was the secret illegal Reformed churches. During the twelve years' reign of Henry II, eighty-eight heretics had been burnt at the stake. During a few months of the rule of the Guise over two hundred were burnt. In addition, the Guise drew

upon themselves the hatred of a class small but dangerous, the professional captains of the regular army. When they came up to court to demand their back pay for the war just finished, they were summarily dismissed with threats and many of them left swearing vengeance.

A country gentleman organized a conspiracy among these captains and some of the lesser nobility. Its objects were to execute the Guise for treason, restore the Bourbons and the Montmorency to their place in government, stop the persecution and call the Estates General. It was not backed by any of the great anti-Guise or pro-reform nobles and Calvin strongly disapproved of it. "If," he wrote, "a single drop of blood is shed, rivers of it will flow." The badly made plan was feebly executed. The Guise got word of it and the conspirators, concentrating in small bands on the Château of Amboise, where the King was staying, were killed or captured. More than seventy-five were summarily decapitated, tied to poles and thrown into the river, or hung in a row from the battlements of the castle.

This abortive conspiracy and its savage punishment helped to change the Reformed churches from patient endurers of persecution for conscience sake, into an element of a political party, for which popular speech coined the (mysterious) name Huguenot. The beginnings of that terrible partisan hatred which was soon to spread over France, can be seen on the following incident. The young Agrippa d'Aubigné, the future Huguenot captain, then a lad of ten years old, was passing through Amboise with his father. The heads of the chief conspirators were still fixed in spikes above the city gates. When they had passed, his father took him by the hand and said: "My child, you must not spare your head after mine. Revenge those chieftains, full of honour, whose heads you have just seen. If you spare yourself in this matter you will have my curse upon you."

The debts of the crown compelled the calling of the Estates General—which had not met in seventy years. Before it could assemble, the Prince of Condé, a brother of Anthony of Bourbon, was arrested, tried before a royal council controlled by safe Guise men and condemned to death for treason. His life was saved by the sudden death of the boy King (Dec. 1560) from an abscess of the inner ear which the surgery of the day could not handle.

The new King, Charles IX, was only ten years old and his mother, the Florentine Catherine de Médicis, who had made all preparations, at once assumed the regency. The Estates General endorsed her power, although she was obliged to share it ostensibly with the first prince of the blood royal, Anthony of Bourbon, King of Navarre. She was a shrewd woman, whose skill in manipulating practical politics was untroubled by moral scruple and undirected by any large political ideas. In an age when many men were willing to kill or to die for their beliefs about religion, she was entirely free from fanaticism or even zeal. The six thousand of her letters which have survived, frequently mention her gratitude or her hopes for God's assistance, but not a single phrase can be found in them which would enable a reader to decide whether she was a Protestant or a Catholic: a thing not unique among men or women of the late Renascence.

She had many pleasures ranging from a huge appetite for melons to a cultivated liking for architecture, but her strongest taste was a love of political power. She was able to gratify it under the names of her two sons during twenty-eight years, not only because of her skill, but also because of an enormous capacity for sustained work—a capacity in which her sons were conspicuously lacking. She was devoted to her children, but her final bitter hatred for her obstinately rebellious daughter Margaret suggests that, unconsciously, she loved in them the extension

of her own ego. The difficulties she faced and partly overcame, were enormous. For, as she wrote to her daughter, the Queen of Spain, she was: "left with three little children in a realm completely split up, without a single person sufficiently disinterested for me to be able to trust him entirely."

When the Prince of Condé was set free, he took back his sword cursing the Duke of Guise. The Venetian Ambassador wrote home: "There are many old enmities at court, especially between members of the houses of Bourbon, Montmorency, and Guise. The Constable will accept no equal and the Cardinal of Lorraine will brook no superior and he is hated by every one."

For the pressing problem of religion, Catherine proposed a policy of conciliation, which she justified thus to her son-in-law, the sternly orthodox Philip II of Spain: "We have, during twenty or thirty years, tried cautery, and violence has only increased the contagion of evil. Many people of good judgment say that the public death of those who confess the new opinions spreads and strengthens them. . . . I have been counselled by all the princes of the blood and other lords of the royal council to follow the way of gentleness in the matter; to try by remonstrances, exhortations, and preaching to lead back those who are wandering in the faith and to punish severely those who are guilty of sedition."

In this situation—a boy King—an Italian woman regent—three jealous aristocratic factions struggling for power—the Guise made skilful political use of the problem which confronted the government. On the great question of what to do about heresy, they stood solid themselves and split the Bourbons and the Montmorency. An alliance was formed between the Duke of Guise, the Constable Montmorency and the Marshal St. André "to seek the remedy for the affairs of religion": and everybody knew that meant the revival of stern persecution.

To this group, popularly known as the "Triumvirate," there were later joined the King of Navarre, his brother, the Cardinal of Bourbon and several of his cousins. His brother, the Prince of Condé and the three sons of the Constable's sister, Coligny, Admiral of France, d'Andelot, Captain General of Infantry, and the Cardinal of Châtillon, one of the wealthiest ecclesiastics of France, together with the Queen of Navarre, openly joined the party of the Huguenots.

The two factions of Huguenots and Catholics were not mere court factions. News of terrible acts of mob fanaticism against heresy, answered by cruel reprisals, came up from the province of Guienne which was drifting rapidly into open civil war. Catherine sent down two civil commissioners backed by a military force commanded by Blaise de Monluc, a veteran of the wars against Spain. They were instructed that the "King hoped more from prudence and dexterity than from force."

Monluc's interpretation of this commission can be understood in the following extract from his vivacious memoirs. He ordered four men arrested and, when he met them, he was accompanied by two executioners with sharp swords. Testimony was given that they had used rebellious words and Monluc tells us he called out: "You miserable scoundrel, have you really dared to soil your wicked tongue by speaking against your King? He answered, 'Oh! Sir, have mercy on a miserable sinner.' I seized him and pushed him roughly to the earth and his head fell exactly upon a piece of the base of a cross which had been broken in a Huguenot riot. I called out to the executioner: 'Strike, fellow.' My words and his blow followed one upon the other and the blow carried off more than a half a foot of stone at the base of the cross. I had two others hung to an elm that stood just opposite and because the fourth (a deacon of the church) was

only eighteen years old, I did not want to put him to death. But I had him given so many blows of the whip by the two executioners that I am told he died ten or twelve days afterward. This was the first execution that I made without sentence or putting pen to paper, because in this sort of an affair it is best to begin with an execution. If all those who had authority in the provinces had done the same thing, the fire would have been put out which has since burnt everything."

After a colloquy at Poissy between the Roman Catholic and Reformed theologians had failed to produce the agreement she hoped for, Catherine in her secret dislike and fear of the Guise, turned toward the Reformed. She sent word to the elders of the churches that the magistrates would be told in the case of orderly congregations to be lenient in the enforcement of oppressive edicts. When she heard that the King of Spain, whom she both hated and feared, was ready to invade France, in support of the orthodox party, she asked Admiral Coligny, the brains of the Huguenots, to give her a list of the Reformed churches. The replies showed there were twenty-five hundred in France. In each of them there was read by order of Catherine a written appeal "to consider as soon as possible what offer it can make to the King . . . of men, either infantry or cavalry, which it can support at its own expense, to maintain the crown of the realm against any who would wish to invade it." She showed herself very indulgent to Huguenots at court and gave the King's younger brother a Huguenot tutor, so that the boy used to go around bragging: "I am the little Huguenot, but by and by I will be the big Huguenot."

His sister Margaret has left in her memoirs this vignette: "My brother, afterwards the King of France, could not avoid being impressed by the unhappy *hugonoterie*. He was always urging me to change my religion, often threw my prayer books into the fire and instead of them

gave me psalms and Huguenot prayers, compelling me to carry them. I answered his threats by bursting into tears, because I was at the very tender age of seven or eight years. He replied that he could have me whipped or killed if he wanted. I answered that he could have me whipped or have me killed if he chose to, but that I would suffer everything that could be done to me rather than damn my soul."

Through the pen of one of her bishops, Catherine also sent a letter to the Pope asking concessions to the Reformed which might keep the realm completely under obedience both to the King and the Holy See. Pointing out that there were no heretics in France who denied the doctrines defined by the first six general councils of the Church, she asked that images might be removed from the altars and put on the outside of church buildings, that the spiritual meaning of the mass should always be explained, that psalms might be sung in public worship by the people and prayers made in a language they understood.

Out of this mood of conciliation came the Edict of January (1562), the beginning of a long series of shifting and changing edicts about religion, which found its close in the Edict of Nantes in 1598. The Edict of January gave the Reformed Church a legal standing in France. It granted its members complete liberty of conscience and a certain liberty of worship outside the walls of the cities where they lived. It was received with an outburst of indignation from the Triumvirate and their adherents of the extreme orthodox party. The Huguenots, at first grateful, came to feel that the liberty it granted them was too limited. There were numbers of men on both sides who did not want to keep the Edict. The fuel was laid for a great conflagration and the affair of Vassy (March 1562) started the flames.

The Duke of Guise, coming through the little town of

Vassy, found there a Huguenot congregation worshipping, as he thought, illegally. Out of the dispute with the soldiers of his guard, two hundred in number, came an attack on the worshippers which killed forty-five and wounded nearly a hundred. Only one man of the Duke's suite was wounded. It was not a fight but a massacre.

As the news of this slaughter spread the Huguenot gentry rose all over France and rode toward Paris to join their titular leader Condé, the ranking prince of the blood on their side. But the bulk of them had to come from south of the Loire. The Triumvirate rallied their forces first and, in addition, Paris was passionately for the Guise. Condé had to abandon the capital where, as one of his captains wrote: "he could no more fight Guise than a fly could fight an elephant."

After the capital, the second point to be gained was the possession of the boy King. For, as the Venetian Ambassador wrote: "The power of the King of France is founded on a respect and love which reaches almost to adoration: a thing absolutely unique, which can be seen nowhere else in Christendom." Before Guise got to Paris, Catherine had written Condé a note with the postscript "burn this instantly," begging him "to save the children, the mother and the realm." But, as she thought it over, she judged, and the event showed she judged rightly, that the Most Christian King of France could not save his crown at the head of a faction of heretics. She was at the Château of Fontainebleau, whence she could easily have escaped to the camp of the Huguenots. Their emissary lingered until Guise was almost at the gates trying to persuade her to go with him, but she waited and allowed the Guise to take her and the King to Paris.

Thus began perhaps the most terrible of all the experiences through which France has been obliged to pass; the civil wars about religion.

Beza, Calvin's most trusted friend, coming before the

outbreak of war, to demand justice of Catherine for the massacre of Vassy, had said to the King of Navarre: "Sire, it is in truth the lot of the Church of God to endure blows and not to strike them. But may it please your Majesty to remember that it is an anvil which has worn out many hammers." It was human enough for the Huguenots to grow tired of receiving blows, but the Reformed Church was never so strong again in France as it was before April 1562, when Condé and Coligny seized Orleans and began civil war. What small chance the Calvinists may have had to persuade France to follow the example of England, Scotland, the Scandinavian Kingdoms, a number of the German states and many of the Swiss cantons in revolting from the Papacy, they lost when they took arms. The Venetian Ambassador wrote to the Senate: "If it had not been for the war, France would be at present Huguenot, because the people were rapidly changing their faith and the ministers had acquired great credit among them. . . . But when they exchanged words for arms and began to rob and kill, the people said, 'What sort of a religion is this? Where do they find in the Gospel that Christ commanded us to take the goods of our neighbours and kill our comrades?'" In the midst of war the poet Ronsard called on Beza, "Preach no more in France a gospel of arms, a Christ decked with pistols, all blackened by smoke with a steel cap on his head, and in his hand a broad cutlass red with human blood." The Huguenots rose, after long sufferings in self defense, but it seemed to France that they fought for conquest.

During the twenty-nine years from 1562 to 1591, France saw eight renewals of the Huguenot wars. The organized hostilities of these ranged from four months to sixty-four months; the total of acknowledged warfare amounting to eleven years and a half. In the intervals of peace there were also sporadic local conflicts, which, in

some parts, brought about an anarchy worse than organized war. In the declarations which announced these eight wars, many causes came to be alleged as reasons for taking arms. But the chief difficulty in making peace was always the question how much toleration was to be granted.

There were occasional chivalric acts like Coligny opening the battle of Moncontour by killing in single combat the Rhinegrave, riding thirty paces in advance of the royal German mercenaries, or the Sire de Vezins saving his lifelong Huguenot foe from a treacherous death at St. Bartholomew. But, in general, these wars furnish horrible examples of the ferocity of which the human animal is capable when he is organized to kill and be killed. The moderate Roman Catholic contemporary, Etienne Pasquier, sums up the situation very justly: "It would be impossible to tell you what barbarous cruelties are committed on both sides. Where the Huguenot is master, he ruins all the statues, demolishes the sepulchres and tombs, takes away all the consecrated objects in the churches. In exchange the Catholic murders all those he knows belong to that faith and fills the rivers with their corpses. Added to this there is a good deal of private revenge under cover of the public quarrel."

The deeds that most enraged the Huguenots were the brutal murders and massacres, often in the intervals of peace, by the debased and superstitious mobs of the cities. Their cruelty was frequently increased by the preaching of fanatic monks and this was the reason why Huguenot troops on campaign were apt to kill all monks on whom they could lay their hands—a slaughter matched by Catholic soldiers who exterminated what they called "that vermin of ministers." In Paris these mob murders were continuous in peace or war. A contemporary writes from that city: "It is enough for a street urchin to call out 'There goes a Huguenot' and a crowd gathers, kills him,

strips him, and boys drag the body through the streets and throw it into the river. If they kill a citizen, they plunder his house and usually kill his wife and children."

The savagery of the orthodox troops was stimulated by a shameless propaganda which alleged that terrible debaucheries went on in the secret assemblies of the Reformed. There was an old fable about "the Smearers," people in a conspiracy to spread the plague; an imaginary crime for which fifteen women had been burnt in Calvinistic Geneva in 1545. This was revived and applied to the Huguenots. In the peace after the first war, it was reported by several correspondents from Lyons that the Huguenots were poisoning the soup at the inns to spread the plague and had smeared more than seven hundred houses with pest salve.

The hatred of the Roman Catholic side was exasperated, not only by this propaganda, but also by a strange form of so-called iconoclasm, *i. e.* the destruction of all statues and ornaments in churches. In some places the Huguenot soldiers destroyed tombs and burnt the bones of the dead. The denunciations of this barbarity by men like Beza and the punishments inflicted by the Huguenot commanders, could not stop these desecrators of tombs. The exalted fanatics felt they were imitating King Josias, of whom we are told in the Book of Kings that he "burnt the bones of idolaters on the altars of their idols in order to purge Jerusalem of abominations." Indeed, both sides studied and followed the Old Testament very much more than the New.

In estimating the cruelty of these wars, we must not forget that general European war had stopped only in 1559 and fighting men had seen terrible slaughter, arson, rape and pillage in the long Valois-Habsburg struggle. Otherwise we are in danger of thinking that crimes are peculiar to the Huguenot wars which were common to the wars of preceding generations.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE BACKBONE OF THE HUGUENOT ARMIES. THE KING'S MOTHER AND COLIGNY BECOME RIVALS FOR THE EAR OF THE KING

An English ambassador pointed out that a civil war in England would be much shorter than in France because of the lack of a large number of walled towns. There were about four hundred chartered towns in France more or less well fortified and the Huguenots usually began an uprising by plots to seize a number of Catholic towns. They drew from friendly towns arquebusiers and field pieces. But the backbone of their armies was their cavalry, whose ranks were filled by the lesser nobles or country gentlemen. In the reign of Charles IX the French peerage had ten princes, ten dukes, a hundred counts and about a hundred viscounts. But there were thousands of country gentry who lived on their estates and seldom went far from home except for war.

The first part of the sixteenth century was a time of prosperity. The population increased, great stretches of forest were cleared, many new grist mills were built and France became a large exporter of grain. The rental value of land rose steadily and out of proportion to the fall in the value of money caused by the precious metals from the South American mines; which, in the single year 1545, sent to Europe almost as much gold as had been mined in the world in the fifty previous years. Agricultural prosperity brought wealth to the country gentry who paid no taxes.

Most of them lived in manor houses, which were a complex of buildings containing in one group everything nec-

essary for the cultivation of the domain and the life of the master. The manor was not luxuriously furnished and one of its chief rooms was the kitchen, where the whole household, master and domestics, met more or less frequently. Many of the smaller gentry dined in the kitchen and, in the cold winter evenings, the lord and lady often sat in their high-backed arm chairs under the hood of the great chimney. But the manor houses all had a *salon* on whose walls hung a couple of swords, a couple of pikes and halberds, two or three mail coats, some bows, arbalests and hackbuts. The hawk sat on his perch in the corridor, the nets for hunting were thrown down in the corner and, under the great bench against the wall, the hunting dogs lay on fresh straw.

Secure in the distinction of his rank, the country gentleman lived as a good fellow among his neighbours of lower position and was usually on familiar terms with the freeholders and peasants. At fêtes and markets, he drank at the village inn and danced with the peasant girls and his own domestics.

In the reign of Henry II there began a marked change in the condition of the country gentry. Forty years later a writer assumes that every one knows "how thoroughly the gentlemen of France have lost the prosperity in which they lived up to the accession of Henry II." This seems to have been largely due to abandoning the old simple patriarchal life "to change fustian for silk until finally even the pages were clad in cloth of gold." Many a country gentleman became discontented with his plain ancestral house and remodelled it in the newer and more stately fashion suggested by Italy. The second and third generations of the sixteenth century saw many "follies" erected to impoverish once flourishing estates whose owners, when they received their father's old friends, were obliged to regale them chiefly by discourses on architecture.

There was a well known monk, welcome in many châteaux because of his charming social qualities, who was "wont to say, 'Oh what is the use of these beautiful towers, salons and cabinets where the cooking pots are so cold and the cellars so empty? By the worthy slipper of the Pope (his usual oath), I like better to lodge under a low roof and to hear from my room the music of turning spits and smell the fragrance of roasts and to see the sideboard well covered with bottles, than to visit in these grand palaces, to take beautiful walks through stately halls, breaking a fast with a toothpick.' "

In the days of Francis I the nobles feared the expense of court service. The King's household had only one hundred and sixty officers. But beginning with the reign of his son, there was a steady increase in the roll of courtiers. As the gentry began to feel the attraction of court life, many tired of an isolation where they were "free as the Doge of Venice" and gave mortgages to enable them to carry their "mills, forests and meadows on their backs." They became so avid for court appointments that one of them said his fellows were "chasing offices like swallows after flies."

Even from so brief a description of the character and life of the country gentry, it requires little imagination to see how quickly formidable armies could be raised among the lords of the manor, their sons and servitors; embittered by persecution, sometimes maddened by the cruel death of a friend in the mob massacres which often heralded outbreaks of the intermittent civil war. As the word spread from manor to manor, the horses were saddled, the arms taken down from the wall, purses filled from the strong box under the master's bed and, in little groups of relatives and retainers, the elements of what was probably the best cavalry then in the world, filled with native courage and well leavened with veterans of the Franco-Spanish war, flowed rapidly from all direc-

tions toward the mustering place. In this way a single gentleman of the south, travelling from château to manor, arrived at his destination with over five hundred horsemen at his back. On one occasion, at the call of Coligny and his brother, three thousand mounted men gathered in six days.

The Edict of St. Germain was issued August, 1570, and closed the third Huguenot war. It established freedom of conscience for Calvinists and gave all nobles of the higher ranks the right to hold in their châteaux Reformed worship open to all who wished to come. The country gentry might hold worship in their manors for their household and ten friends. Burghers might worship in all towns held by the Huguenots when the Edict was issued and in twenty-four other cities in the provinces.

This peace, which disgusted the faction of the Triumvirate, brought the leaders of the Huguenots to court. On the sixth of June, 1572, Admiral Coligny arrived accompanied by three hundred horse. Two days later, the ostensible chiefs of the party, the young King of Navarre and the young Prince of Condé (their fathers had fallen in the civil wars) entered Paris with a thousand horses in their train. The young King, Charles IX, who had already shown restlessness under his mother's control, was much impressed by the strong personality of Admiral Coligny. He had a plan to unite Huguenot and Catholic in a war upon Spain, the ancient enemy, who had for years done her best to weaken France by keeping alive civil war. The occasion for war on Spain he saw in the revolt of the northern Netherlands. The Hollanders, permeated by Calvinist doctrine, had long suffered the most terrible persecution of modern times. In addition, their Spanish masters had crushed them with taxes, violated their chartered rights and exposed them to the outrages of Spanish regiments. In the spring of 1572, the Dutch insurgents, who had been driven to fight on the sea, took

the town of Brill, and Holland began an intermittent struggle for liberty which lasted for seventy-five years.

Catherine had another plan to heal the breach between the two parties; the marriage of the King's sister Margaret to young Henry of Bourbon, King of Navarre, and titular head of the Huguenot party. For this wedding the King invited to Paris all the leaders of the Huguenots and it was celebrated with great pomp in front of Notre Dame (August 18th, 1572).

Coligny favoured this marriage but he thought it not enough to unite the two factions. Immediately after the wedding he pointed out to his cousin, Marshal Damville (the son of the old Constable killed on the field of battle) the banners hanging in Notre Dame which had been taken in the great Huguenot defeat at Moncontour and said: "In a little while we shall take down these banners and put others in their places pleasanter for Frenchmen to look at." But Catherine was afraid of war with Spain. She always disliked war which gave no scope for her talents in diplomatic intrigue. A conflict arose between her and Coligny for the control of the mind of the King; a youth who frequently showed kindly and generous impulses, but a neurotic, with a morbid pleasure in the sight of blood and given, like his brother, to uncontrollable outbursts of rage. Coligny's policy, although rejected by the royal council under Catherine's influence, was backed not only by the middle party called the Politiques, orthodox and tolerant,—but also by several great lords of the straight out Catholic party. It was evident that he had very great influence over the King.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW. THE POLITIQUE PARTY BELIEVES THAT ONLY TOLERANCE CAN BRING PEACE

The one thing Catherine had always bitterly resented was an attempt to weaken her control over her children. She determined to do what she had been repeatedly urged to do by backers of the Triumvirate or by messages from Spain—to kill Coligny. She did not have to go far to find killers. Henry, the young son of Duke Francis of Guise and his widow, an Italian very friendly with Catherine, believed that Coligny had sent the assassin who killed Duke Francis nine years before. The King had refused to allow Duke Henry to fight a duel with Coligny and imposed peace on the quarrel. Now, at a hint from the Queen Dowager, the vendetta blazed out. On the fourth day after the wedding, Coligny was shot returning from the royal council to his lodging near the Louvre. The assassin missed his mark and the balls only wounded Coligny in the arms. The King was furious and appointed a skilful commission to investigate the crime. The circumstantial evidence pointed unmistakably to the Guise; the arrest of either of two fugitives would make the whole story plain and the Guise would never have taken all the blame alone.

Threatened with ruin, Catherine determined about thirty hours after the shooting of Coligny to kill all the leaders of the Protestants. There were not many at court with whom she would have dared discuss such a plan. Her daughter was just married to the chief of the Huguenots, her youngest son, the Duke of Alençon, had so

many heretics in his suite that he was called the "Refuge of the Huguenots." She could not have trusted any prince of the blood except the Duke of Montpensier with such a secret. Nor any of the Politique faction, which included four of the six marshals of France. In so far as we know, there were present at the dark counsels of Saturday night, August 23rd, only three young men, half Italians and barely of age, the King, his next oldest brother, and Henry of Guise. Besides there were Catherine and three Italians she trusted, the Duke of Nevers, de Retz and Birague. The only pure-blooded Frenchman of whose presence we are sure was Marshal Tavannes.

Just how the young King was persuaded we do not know. Catherine had been inseparable from him for eleven years and knew how to play on his neurotic temperament so as to arouse the violent morbid temper which he himself feared. He afterwards used the excuse that the Huguenots had planned to take him prisoner, but there is documentary evidence that he did not believe it.

The city militia was secretly assembled, the royal guards put under arms and, at dawn of the first Sunday after the wedding, the bell of a church near the Louvre gave the signal for the ugliest crime on the pages of modern European history. The more important Huguenot chiefs, who had come to Paris on the King's invitation to his sister's wedding, were systematically killed by the royal guards in the royal palace itself or in their lodgings near by. A few on the list who escaped at first, were carefully hunted down by the orders of Catherine. The Paris mob, protected and helped by the city militia, killed every Huguenot, man, woman and child, upon whom they could lay their hands. The King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé saved their lives by renouncing the Reformed faith.

Orders were sent to continue this massacre all over France, but many governors, Catholics as well as Poli-

tiques, ignored these orders. Twelve out of sixteen political divisions of France, including six of the seven provinces which had the greatest local autonomy, were free from slaughter. The number of victims is hard to reckon. The estimates of twenty-seven writers, contemporary and modern, range from three thousand to one hundred and ten thousand. Probably between three and four thousand perished in Paris and perhaps as many more throughout France. Lord Acton concludes: "No evidence takes us as high as eight thousand."

Three things need perhaps to be said about this crime. 1. The marriage of the King's sister was not a step to draw the Huguenot leaders into the net. The evidence to prove that the massacre was a sudden unscrupulous expedient and not a long crafty treachery, is overwhelming. 2. It was a political and not a religious crime; although it used as one of its tools that cruel fanaticism which under all forms of belief, Pagan, Jewish, Mohammedan or Christian, has loved to drape its hideous form with the mantle of religion. 3. It cannot be called a French crime. In the midnight council which hastily planned it, the clergy were not represented. Two contemporaries do indeed report that Morvillier, who had resigned the bishopric of Orleans to devote himself to the royal service, was summoned at the close. They add that when he heard the decision, he burst into tears. Neither the army, nor the nobility of the robe, nor the higher nobility, nor the country gentry, nor the third estate, were represented. Four full-blooded Italians, three young half-blooded Italians, and one native-born Frenchman, planned the deed.

France repudiated it. Most of the royal governors neglected the secret orders of the King. The nobility of the robe despised its illegality. Auguste de Thou, first President of the Parlement of Paris and anti-Huguenot, was accustomed to apply to St. Bartholomew this verse of Statius: "May the memory of the evil deeds of that day per-

ish; may future generations refuse to believe them; let us certainly keep silent and let the crimes of our own nation be covered by thick darkness."

When the colonel of the royal guard, who had superintended the killings in and near the palace, joined the army at the siege of La Rochelle, his fellow officers sent him to Coventry. He often said to Brantôme, who afterwards used to play tennis with him: "Cursed be the day of St. Bartholomew." The officers of the army were not shocked chiefly by the cruelty of the deed. They held their own lives too cheap to put a very high price on the lives of other men. But they could not stomach the treachery of it. The first gentleman of France had invited his own nobles to the wedding of his sister and killed them in his own palace. A contemporary tells us: "It was repeated everywhere that Captain Pilles, led out for slaughter from the house of his King where he was a guest, cried aloud as the spears pierced him: 'Oh what a peace! Oh what a word of honour!'" Evidently Brantôme, a passionate hero worshipper of the Duke of Guise, spoke for the fighting Catholic nobles of France when he wrote that St. Bartholomew was "a very dirty massacre."

The Venetian envoy extraordinary, who cannot be suspected of any prejudice against Italians, or in favour of heretics, wrote: "The Catholics are disgusted beyond measure as much as the Huguenots, not, as they say, at the deed itself so much as at the way of doing it. . . . They call it a tyrant's way, attributing it to the Queen Mother as an Italian, a Florentine and of the house of the Medici; whose blood is impregnated with tyranny. For this reason she is highly detested and so is the whole Italian nation."

The massacre of St. Bartholomew was a fruitless crime. It did not destroy the Huguenots. Two months after it, the Politique insurgent governor of Languedoc, in answer to a conciliatory message from the King, wrote: "The

Huguenots of Montauban say they would sooner die in a body fighting for their lives than put themselves in the hands of their murderers." Some ministers of La Rochelle published the opinion that it was sinful to take any Catholic prisoners. They should all be put to death as the irreconcilable enemies of God.

In this mood, which would neither give nor ask quarter, the Huguenots stood desperately at bay behind the walls of four strong fortified cities of the south, Sancerre, Nismes, Montauban and La Rochelle. In addition many of the Huguenot gentry of the south and east assembled troops and surprised or stormed nineteen smaller walled towns. Conscious of extreme danger and taught by experience, the churches strengthened their organization sketched by the master hand of Calvin and became a veritable state within a state, with local and central government, a treasury, representative assemblies, and means of mobilizing an army. They found allies in the party of the Politiques, a faction of moderate Catholics hating the Guise and in favour of toleration, who were led by the sons of the old Constable Montmorency.

Above all, the Huguenots finally found a new leader in Henry, King of Navarre, the first of the princes of the blood. Four years after Saint Bartholomew, he escaped from court, repudiated his forced conversion to Catholicism, and, at the age of twenty-three, took command of the Huguenot party. Far inferior in character to Coligny, he was shrewder and more adaptable. He was one of those men whose wit, good humour and good fellowship, make those who know them willing to overlook their weaknesses. He openly defied the moral teachings of the Calvinist preachers whose churches he defended; for, as one of his comrades wrote in his memoirs, "We fought under the banner of Mars and Venus." Charming in peace, his friends found him even more irresistible on the battle field than his enemies did. The genius of vic-

tory rode with him. He knew the technique of his profession and fought no reckless headstrong engagements, but he had the dashing courage that wins the soldier's heart and, like Napoleon, he could match the gallant action by a dramatic word. At his greatest victory, he wore a white plume in his helmet and another nodded on his horse's head. Riding in front of the mass of his cavalry, which he was about to lead to the charge, he called out: "Gentlemen, if you lose sight of your standards, rally on my plume. You will find it on the road to honour and victory."

CHAPTER XXX

THE LEAGUE OF THE HOLY TRINITY. HENRY IV SAVES FRANCE

The success of the Huguenots with the help of their new allies and under their new leader, evoked a new danger for them and for France. Many zealots for the orthodoxy of the kingdom and many of those who believed there was no good Huguenot except a dead one, had for some time been organized into the League of the Holy Trinity. This was given fresh life and vigour when the King's younger brother died and Henry of Navarre became heir-apparent to the throne of France. Within six months (Dec. 1584) the Guise and their friends had made an alliance for the defense of the Roman Catholic religion and the total extirpation of heresy from France and the Netherlands. The Cardinal of Bourbon, the uncle of Henry of Navarre, was named heir to the throne and, in a secret treaty, Philip of Spain promised the Guise 50,000 écus a month; payment to begin when civil war began.

Before this treaty, Guise had drawn into the League of the Holy Trinity a large section of the nobility north of the Loire, Paris and almost all the cities in its vicinity, together with eighty-eight important towns scattered from Provence to Brittany. Thus backed, he forced the King to agree that all subjects must accept Roman Catholicism within six months or leave the kingdom. Henry of Navarre called the Huguenots to arms and the war blazed out again. It is sometimes called the war of the three Henrys (Henry, King of Navarre; Henry, Duke of Guise; and Henry III, King of France).

Henry III is a figure who excites contempt rather than pity. He combined morbid religiosity with debauchery

and, though not without ability, he has been called the worst King who ever tried to rule France. But his situation was certainly pitiable. The papal Nuncio thus describes it: "Here there is war within and without—religious factions, political factions, Catholics and Protestants—Politiques and Leaguers. The hate of the people for the government is great and the King, in spite of his power, is poor. He shows great piety and at the same time detests the League. He makes war on the heretics and is jealous of the success of the Catholics. . . . He fears the defeat of the Catholics and desires it. These conflicting feelings make him distrust his own thoughts."

The person he distrusted most was his old boyhood playmate the Duke of Guise, in whose company he had helped to make the hasty plan for the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Guise controlled the League and the League gave him control of the King. Guise came to court in the teeth of the King's express commands and proved in the "Day of the Barricades" that he was "King of Paris"; adored and obeyed by the mass of the population. The King slipped away from the Louvre by a back door and his mother patched up a false reconciliation between the two Henrys. Six months later Guise showed he was master of the Estates General, which the poverty of the King compelled him to call. In the middle of the summer the Florentine envoy wrote home: "The day of the dagger will come." The King feared that Guise meant to dethrone him and he had reason to fear. On the 23rd of December, 1588, Guise, summoned alone to the King's room, fell under the daggers of nine of the gentlemen of the royal body guard.

Paris flamed into revolt. The preachers swore their congregations to avenge the murder of the champion of the Church. The theological faculty of Paris voted that all subjects were released from the oath of allegiance to Henry III. The Parlement of Paris, reduced to a Rump

Parlement by arrests and expulsions, denounced the King. Only five of the larger cities remained faithful. The rest supported the League. The King did the only thing left for him to do, he made terms with Henry of Navarre and the Huguenot army fought under the royal banner.

From Henry of Navarre, heir to the throne, came one of his vibrant proclamations: "Is it not a miserable state of affairs that while there is no one in this realm whether he be humble or great, who does not see the evil we labour under, who does not cry out against war, who does not call it the chronic and mortal fever of the state, nevertheless, no one has opened his lips to propose the cure? Is it not a miserable thing that, in the whole assembly of the Estates General at Blois, no one should have dared to pronounce that blessed word peace, upon whose realization in fact the whole prosperity of this realm depends? . . . We have all done and suffered enough evil. During four years we have been intoxicated, senseless, mad. Is it not enough?"

These words roused echoes in many hearts, Catholic as well as Huguenot. Thirty thousand Frenchmen rallied to the King and his heir and, with the help of ten thousand mercenaries, Henry of Navarre formed the siege of Paris. The city, reduced to starvation, was on the point of surrender, when a young Jacobin monk gave Henry III a wound with a knife, of which he died the next day—the first King of France to meet a violent death.

The Huguenot who thus became Henry IV of France, saw his army melt away until only half his force was left. With that he held his own by cautious Fabian tactics, combined with willingness to take suddenly great risks, which reminds one vaguely of Washington. England helped him a little directly and still more indirectly, by raids which burnt Spanish ships and plundered Spanish ports until Spain lost all hope of being master of the seas. The Netherlands helped him a great deal against their

common deadly enemy. The Protestant princes of Germany helped him very little; quite largely because of the hatred aroused by disputes between the Lutheran and Calvinist theologians.

From all sides foreigners poured in to dismember France. The Pope declared cut off from the Church and damned all Frenchmen who remained loyal to the man who was proved not to be the rightful King of France by the sole fact that he was a heretic. Charles III, Duke of Lorraine, wanted the province of Champagne. The Duke of Mercœur, brother of the widow of Henry III, wanted to make Brittany an independent duchy. The Duke of Savoy wanted Grenoble, the Rhone valley and Provence to form parts of the revived Kingdom of Arles, whose crown he hoped to wear.

Philip II of Spain did not wish to dismember France. He wanted all of it for his daughter by Elizabeth of Valois, who had been the sister of the last three kings of France. The Salic law which barred a claimant on the distaff side, he disregarded as the English had disregarded it two hundred and fifty years before. It seemed to him merely a French prejudice which could not expect to stand in the way of his plans of restoring Europe under the lead of the House of Habsburg to complete obedience to the Holy Catholic Church.

Henry IV was not merely a skilful cavalry leader who joined dashes of daring to caution. He was a reasoning and inventive soldier who could meet new conditions with new training and tactics. His best troops were the cavalry in which the country gentry fought. But they had been used to charging in line and depending on the lance. He took away the lance and armed them only with the sword and light pistols. Giving the cavalrymen armour heavy enough to turn the ordinary arquebus ball, he massed them into solid squadrons and sent them to the attack, usually at a walk, never faster than a trot. They

had standing orders, like those given nearly two hundred years later by General Putnam at Bunker Hill, not to fire "until they could see the whites of the enemies' eyes." A Venetian Ambassador wrote home: "With one hundred horsemen thus armed and trained, he has broken three hundred or even four hundred enemies fighting in the old way with the lance."

With all his skill, Henry IV could not wage a successful fight against his many enemies except at the head of a united France. He determined therefore to change his religion for the third time and be reconciled to the ancient Church. The effect was immediate. All over France cities began to surrender and nobles to declare for the King. The military governor of Paris and the provost of the merchants, opened the gate of St. Denis to the royal troops who marched to the centre of the city without opposition. At six o'clock the King followed them and in the afternoon the foreign troops, Neapolitans, Walloons and Spaniards, marched out of the same gate, while Henry, from a window, returned the salutes of their colonels and captains. The League, confronted by a legitimate orthodox King, had collapsed. Henry executed no one and less than one hundred and fifty persons were ordered to leave the city. For he never bore malice against those who had injured him.

The submission of France cost Henry IV not only the surrender of his religion, which sat rather lightly on him, but also huge sums of money, favours, and appointments. Every little captain made good terms for himself. The family of Lorraine, which included the Guise, had between them the enormous sum of 9,000,000 *livres*. When his minister of finance protested at this extravagance, the King answered: "We save money. These things would cost us ten times as much if we had to take them by force."

With France behind him, Henry brought Spain to

peace. The Treaty of Vervins (May, 1598) was in essentials and as between France and Spain, a repetition of the Treaty of Cateau Cambrésis. And it marked the failure of the grandiose dreams of the Habsburgs.

It remained for Henry IV to bring the Huguenot wars to a definite close. He did this in the "perpetual and irrevocable" Edict of Nantes (April, 1598). It granted his old followers entire liberty of conscience everywhere. Liberty of worship was given in all places where the Reformed cult was celebrated in 1596; in addition in two new places in each bailiwick of France. Great nobles might hold worship in their châteaux and country gentlemen in their manors might have preaching or the sacraments for thirty people besides their relatives. Four bi-partisan chambers of parlement were given jurisdiction over all cases involving the interests of members of the Reformed Church and all offices of state were open to them on equal terms with Catholics. The whole organization which made the Huguenot party a state within a state was legalized and they were granted about a hundred fortified towns to hold for eight years by their own governors and garrisons; whose salaries and wages were paid by the crown.

"To remember that the thirty-five hundred gentlemen of the Reformed Religion could raise on very short notice twenty-five thousand men, when the total royal army on peace footing did not exceed ten thousand, is to see that an extremely powerful party was protected so far as human prudence could imagine against any return of active intolerance."

CHAPTER XXXI

LITERATURE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. RABELAIS. CALVIN. MONTAIGNE.

The sixteenth century saw the first development in France of masters of language, the influence of whose writings spread so widely and established itself so permanently among men speaking other tongues that their names have an unquestioned right to a place on the list of the greatest writers of modern Europe. Previous to the sixteenth century, England had produced one such man, Chaucer; Italy at least two, Dante and Petrarch. French writers had indeed exercised a very great influence outside the borders of France during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in England, Germany and Italy. But the influence of the chivalric and courtly poetry had been like the leading influence of French gothic art; the mass influence of a school and not the leadership of great individual artists. But in the sixteenth century France produced three writers distinctively French who belong to Europe as well as to France; Rabelais, Calvin and Montaigne.

It is noticeable that while their predecessors upon the general muster roll of literary fame were poets, the three first Frenchmen to attain a place on it wrote no poetry. They were continuing unconsciously the development of French prose from the simple instrument adapted to vivacious recital of facts and experiences used by Villehardouin, Commines and Froissart, to a much richer, stronger and more efficient expression of feeling or grave sustained thought. For while the influence of the Renascence showed itself most notably in England through the production of great poetry, it showed itself in France by the production of great prose.

Sixteenth century France did, indeed, produce poets of delicacy and distinction. Three of them have already been mentioned, Marot of the earlier generation, Ronsard and du Bellay. Du Bellay was the first spokesman of the coterie of seven poets known as the Pleiad, but Ronsard was its real chief. The son of an official of the household of the royal princes, he became a court poet, petted by Catherine de Médicis and her sons; presented with a sideboard inscribed to "Apollo of the Muses Fountain" by Mary, Queen of France and of Scotland. Everyone who could read French in England, Italy, Germany and Poland praised him and he was familiar in the mouths of all in the higher circles of French society, by whom he was called "the Prince of Poets." The First President of the Parlement of Paris expressed the feeling of cultivated Frenchmen generally when he said that the birth of Ronsard on the day of the terrible French defeat at Pavia, had made up for that military disaster. Although Ronsard did not maintain the comparative rank among the world's poets given him by his contemporaries, he has a fresh feeling for certain phases of nature, he knows all the birds and all the flowers, he feels the poetry of the bees and the stars, and, by his success in expressing the soft and gentle emotions of elegiac poetry, as well as by his great technical skill, he deserves a high place among those immortals who have written for lands and ages beyond their own. Some of his shorter pieces belong to the world's anthology.

His services to the development of style and rhythm in French poetry were very great; for instance he used more than a hundred new meters. It was this power of sympathetic imagination, joined to craftsmanship without blemish, which caused a modern English critic to call the following "the most perfect poem which had yet been produced in France":

OF HIS LADY'S OLD AGE

"When you are very old, at evening
You'll sit and spin beside the fire, and say,
Humming my songs, 'Ah well, ah well, a day.
When I was young of me did Ronsard sing.'
None of your maidens that doth hear the thing,
Albeit with her weary task foredone,
But wakens at my name, and calls you one
Blest, to be held in long remembering.

I shall be low beneath the earth, and laid
On sleep, a phantom in the myrtle shade,
While you beside the fire, a grandame gray,
My love, your pride remember and regret;
Ah, love me, love, we may be happy yet,
And gather roses while 'tis called today."

His intimate friend du Bellay had an even more delicate sensibility and though sometimes careless, showed in his shorter poems a very "tender grace." As for example this neo-platonic sonnet "To Heavenly Beauty."

"If this our little life is but a day
In the Eternal,—if the years in vain
Toil after hours that never come again,—
If everything that has been must decay,
Why dreamest thou of joys that pass away,
My soul, that my sad body doth restrain?
Why of the moment's pleasure art thou fain?
Nay, thou hast wings,—nay, seek another stay.

There is the joy whereto each soul aspires,
And there the rest that all the world desires,
And there is love, and peace, and gracious mirth,
And there in the most highest heavens shalt thou
Behold the Very Beauty, whereof now
Thou worshippedst the shadow upon Earth."

(A. LANG.)

Rabelais was born about 1495. He became a Franciscan monk at an early age, but later obtained a papal dispensation to lay aside his robe. He became an ordi-

nary clergyman and was titular rector of the church of the little village of Meudon. Before this he had studied medicine at two or three French universities and practiced the art; finally serving for some years as professor of medicine at the University of Montpellier. For a time at Lyons he worked as an editor of medical works and from the learned press he served in this capacity, passed into relations with a publisher of popular books in French. He wrote for him a series of eighteen annual almanacs and rewrote a burlesque romance of chivalry called "Chronicles of the Great Giant Gargantua" which had great success. This grew in the next twenty years into what we know as the work of Rabelais which was, by common consent of all modern critics, the greatest book that had yet been written in France.

This rank is given to it in spite of the fact that parts of it are extremely obscene. That he was writing for a debased popular taste is no sufficient explanation of this. For the popular taste was not as debased as it had been in the days of the fabliaux, and Rabelais is in this respect a retrogression. An eminent French critic [Lanson] believes that his "enormous obscenity" expresses his deliberate intent to display with equal plainness all sides of human life; the purely animal side as clearly as the rational and sentimental side. If this be true, it was the expression of his own taste, because it was an expression of his view that life and all its essential parts is entirely good. On this hypothesis, it becomes, while much greater in degree, the same in kind as the theoretical and deliberate indecency which American readers can see in Walt Whitman's "Leaves of Grass." Whatever its cause, it is a great pity, for in the words of an English critic who ranks Rabelais with Dante, Cervantes, Shakespeare and Gœthe, "the result is that no writer of anything like his importance is so little read."

In spite of its indecency, in spite of much matter which

is purely ludicrous, the intent of the book is extremely serious. Rabelais is a satirist but not a melancholy, cynical satirist. He has no sarcastic, bitter smile, but a great roaring laugh, compatible with strong hatred but without concealed malice. He began, like Cervantes, with a parody of fantastic chivalry, he satirizes, like Erasmus, the passion for military conquest, he makes drastic fun of the administration of justice, but the two chief points of his interest are his hatred of the entire monastic ideal of life and his criticism of the methods of education.

The best illustration of both of these is his account of the abbey of Theleme which Prince Gargantua builds to reward the monk who helped him defeat his enemies. With great satiric force Rabelais pictures a monastic establishment which is to be in all respects the exact opposite of an actual monastery. Monasteries had walls around them—therefore Theleme was to be without walls. Because monks had to do things at certain hours—there were to be no clocks or dials at Theleme. Monasteries had in them no women—therefore there were to be women at Theleme. Women taken into convents were "one eyed, limping, humpbacked, ugly, fools" and men who entered monasteries were "ugly, imbeciles and burdens to their families." At Theleme were to be none but handsome women and strong, handsome and able men. All monks and nuns, after a time of probation, took vows to stay forever. Any one could leave Theleme at any time. The building was not to be severe but magnificent; with pillars of chalcedony, and porphyry. The nuns were clothed in satin, damask and velvet; orange, green, yellow, red, white, cloth of gold and of silver. The men wore splendidly embroidered garments.

"All their life was regulated—not by laws or rules—but according to their wish and free will. They got out of bed when it seemed time to them, they drank, ate, worked, slept when they felt like it: no one waked them,

no one compelled them to drink, nor to eat, nor to do anything else. So Gargantua had ordered it to be. In their monastic rule there was only one clause: *'Do what you want to do.'* Because free people, well born, well brought up, living with honest companions, have by nature an instinct and impulse which always inclines them toward virtue and draws them back from vice—which impulse is called honour. When, however, by vile subjection and restraint they are repressed and enslaved, they turn the noble affection by which they tended frankly toward virtue into the effort to break and throw off this yoke of servitude; for we undertake always to do forbidden things and we covet what is denied to us."

"By that liberty they entered into praiseworthy emulation of all doing what pleased one. If one said 'Let us drink,' they all drank. If one said 'Let's go for a stroll in the fields,' they all went. . . ."

"They were so well taught that there was no one among them who could not read, write, sing, play on harmonious instruments, speak and write five or six languages. No one had ever seen cavaliers so bold, so gallant, so dextrous in the saddle, or on foot. . . . No one had ever seen ladies so neat, so charming, less tedious, more skilled of hand at the needle or at everything that belongs to the abilities of a free and honest woman." "For that reason when the time came that some one of that abbey wished to leave it, either at the request of their parents or for other causes, he took with him one of the ladies and they were married, and if they had lived at Theleme in love and friendship, still more did they continue it in marriage: So much so that they loved each other at the end of their days as at the first day of their marriage."

Rabelais expressed belief in God, in prayer and immortality. How much more of the doctrine of the Church he held is a matter of dispute. He was a Humanist rather than a Reformer. He was attacked both by the hyper-

orthodox Sorbonne and by the heretics. His belief in the perfection of human nature, his rationalistic optimism is difficult to reconcile with fundamental Christian doctrine. If he had been forced to a sincere choice, he would have preferred the ancient Church, of which he was a priest, to the doctrine and discipline of the man whom he called "The demoniac Calvin, the impostor of Geneva."

Rabelais was the first man to master the wonderful instrument of French prose style. His writing covers a wide range, from terse, almost bare, narrative to outbursts of rhythmic prose which show the feeling and the music of poetry. He passes from lofty eloquence to vivid colloquialism. He had the *copia verborum* of all great writers, his vocabulary was prodigious. From his vast reading in the literature of Greece and Rome, of France and Italy, he took whatever he fancied. He coined hundreds of words, some of which were added to the language and others never used again. But in spite of this exuberance, this seemingly careless energy, he had great skill in fitting together the parts of a long and intricate sentence and still keeping its meaning clear.

A large number of people for many generations have liked the doctrines of John Calvin and a larger number have heartily disliked them; his church polity spread, usually illegally, into many lands where it excited admiration and fear; therefore the fame of Calvin as a theologian and ecclesiastic has obscured, for millions of people, outside of France, the fact that he was one of the early masters of modern French prose and contributed important elements to its development. Although he is not to be considered as great a writer as Rabelais, yet he had more influence, directly and indirectly, upon subsequent masters of French prose like Pascal, Bossuet and Voltaire than that boisterous and exuberant genius. Calvin was a profound thinker and a good craftsman, but not a genius. His greatest book was the *Institutes of the*

Christian Religion which in twenty years he put through eight editions, the last, five times as long as the first.

The matter of this treatise on theology is the same as that of the Scholastic theologians and it follows the divisions of the Athanasian creed. But Calvin, who was a Humanist before he became a Protestant, applied the method of the *new learning* to theology by finding the bases of his argumentation "in nature, in fact, in experience." He tries to fit together dogma and the nature of man and draws from human needs the proofs of a corresponding religion. At the same time he uses in reading the text of Scripture as the chief source of dogma, the sort of comment the Humanists had applied to Homer and Livy. He was not only a theologian but also a powerful psychologist and moralist. "Since Cicero and Seneca nobody had written on man with such breadth and precision." [Lanson.]

That doctrine of predestination which, as years passed, came to bulk larger and larger in his mind and disturb the rational balance of his theological thinking, has seemed to his adversaries to atrophy the human will and theoretically render moral actions impossible. But as a matter of fact, it did not paralyze the energies of his followers. Calvinists did not guide their action by the maxim that, since God foresaw and ruled everything, it made no difference what a man did. A cursory examination of the active part played in the political history of Europe, in Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland, Scotland, England and the United States, by disciples of Calvin, who developed his new plan for church organization, makes evident that the last thing which can be charged against the Calvinists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is a lack of energy and a supine acceptance of what was.

Under the circumstances already related Calvin put the second edition of his book into French. It was the first French book written on a regular plan and his lucid and

logical mind carried out that plan with simple directness and a precision and clarity now fully employed for the first time in French for the grave and sustained discussion of ideas. He had neither leisure nor desire for artistic finish. All he desired to do was to be plain and convincing; though at times his earnest wish to carry conviction makes his very simplicity eloquent. Here is an example. "Because no one of us, so long as we remain in this earthly prison of the body, is so strong and well disposed that he presses forward in his course with the agility he ought to show: nay because the greater part of us is so feeble and weak that it falters and halts so much that it cannot make great progress; let each of us go forward according to his small ability and let us not give up following the way on which we have started. No one will follow the way so weakly as not to advance each day and to gain at least a little ground. Let us not cease to make the effort to advance daily in the way of the Lord: and let us not lose courage if we gain only a little. For although the fact does not correspond to our hope, nevertheless our hope is not all lost when to-day rises above yesterday. Only let us fix our eyes with a pure and straight-forward simplicity on our goal and make ourselves arrive at our end: not fooling ourselves with vain flattery and not granting pardon to our vices: but rather forcing ourselves without ceasing to act so that we may become from day to day better than we are, until we arrive at the sovereign goodness; which we have to seek after and follow all the time of our life in order to lay hold upon it when, having put off the infirmity of our flesh, we shall become full sharers in it: that is to say when God shall receive us into His company."

Jacques Amyot, university professor, tutor of the King's sons, Bishop of Auxerre, performed the difficult task of writing translations so perfect that they have almost the literary value of original works. He made

Plutarch a Frenchman and, for generations, an element in directing the moral conceptions of France. In addition, his style became a model of grace and charm and he enriched the language by definitely fixing in it many terms in politics, philosophy, science and music.

The men of the sixteenth century were great letter writers and the best letter writer of his age—one of the best of all ages—was Henry IV whose letters preserve for us his tact and his great personal charm. Here is one to the captain of his body guard: "Brave Crillon go hang yourself because you were not here beside me at the prettiest affair ever seen—and perhaps that ever will be seen. Believe me, I longed heartily for you. The Cardinal called on us very furiously but went back very shamefully. I hope next Thursday to be in Amiens where I shall stay only long enough for some great undertaking, for I have now one of the finest armies imaginable. It lacks nothing except the brave Crillon who will be always welcome to me. A Dieu—Sept 20th (1597) in camp before Amiens."

Here is another: "My mistress, I write you this word the day before a battle. The issue of it is in the hands of God, who has already ordained that outcome of it which He knows to be expedient for His glory and the safety of my people. If I lose it, you will never see me again, for I am not a man to fly or give ground. But I can assure you that, if I die, my last thought but one will be of you, and my last of God, to whom I recommend you —and also myself. This last of August 1590 by the hand of him who kisses both of your hands and is your servitor." Is it any wonder that a man who could talk, write and fight like that could save France from the misery of civil war and foreign conquest?

In the three generations which elapsed between 1570 and 1660 France produced many specimens of that form of literature known as memoirs. It is a literary form pe-

culiarly French, in the sense that no other nation has produced either so many—or so many of charm and distinction which reveal vividly the personality of the writer. Specimens have been given already from the memoirs of a cultivated queen and a rough soldier. The surgeon Ambrose Paré (1510-1590) and the man of science Bernard Palissy (1515+ to 1590) have left accounts of their lives. Paré was one of the founders of modern surgery. Among other things he developed a technique which for the first time made amputation on a large scale possible. He entirely abandoned the mediæval method of deducing treatment from theory and based his practice on experience and experiment. Palissy was a land surveyor and artisan in stained glass who became one of the earliest of modern scientists and expressed conclusions gained from observation in agricultural fertilization, natural history, mineralogy, religion and the making of pottery. The homely tragedy of his prolonged and vain attempt to imitate in spite of bitter poverty, white Chinese porcelain, gives dignity to his simple narrative.

Michel de Montaigne was the son of a wealthy merchant who had been mayor of Bordeaux and of a Jewish mother, the daughter of a merchant of Toulouse; who probably became a Protestant. At thirty-eight, Michel resigned his seat in the Parlement of Bordeaux and retired to the family château about thirty-five miles from the city. While his wife managed the estate, he spent most of his time in his library; an oval room twenty-seven feet long, around which there were ranged a thousand books in low bookcases. In this quiet retreat, while the Huguenot wars and the wars of the League raged, he spent most of his life in reading, reflecting and writing. Although he was content with his books, he travelled occasionally; on one leisurely trip of eighteen months reaching Rome. He also served two terms as mayor of Bordeaux. But his book was the product of the life he spent in his library. His

numerous commentators have engaged in unsettled controversies on many general questions such as: was he simply studying and recording the facts of his own personality or did he desire to propagate a philosophy of life? Was he a believer in Christianity, a disbeliever or indifferent?

Certain things are evident. If Calvin wrote the first French book on a vigorous logical plan, Montaigne did not follow his example. His Essays have no more constructive plan than a miscellaneous mass of packages thrown into baskets. The longer essays are filled with digressions without logical relation to each other and frequently without any visible connection with the subject. The negligence and laziness of his method sometimes affects his style and his sentences become obscure. Emerson says: "I do not know any book which seems less written." It is the product, wrought out in years, of a man sitting in slippered ease and soliloquizing on every random topic which came into his head. Many of the essays are stuffed with quotations and he often borrows without quoting, but no more original book was ever written.

Although his book was begun without plan he gradually became conscious that he was developing a very definite theme. That theme as he tells us over and over again is himself, and his summary of what he has written appears in his preface. "It was my wish to be seen in my simple, natural and ordinary garb, without study or artifice, for it was myself I had to paint. . . ." "Thus reader, thou perceivest I am myself the matter of my book." For Montaigne describes himself not in the spirit of egotism as a distinguished man, but in the temper of a philosopher, as an ordinary man, an epitome of humanity.

He begins his essay "Of Prayers" by saying that what he has written he himself condemns as absurd and impious, "if anything shall be found set down in this rhap-

sody, through ignorance or inadvertence, contrary to the holy precepts of the Apostolical and Roman Catholic Church, in which I was born and in which I will die." This might have been only the formal cautionary phrase of a man who had not the temperament of a martyr. But there seems to be a note of sincerity in his recommendation of the constant use of the Lord's prayer, "a form of prayer prescribed and dictated to us, word for word, from the mouth of God himself," and he appears also to be asserting his convictions when he writes, "I believe that the liberty every one has taken to disperse holy writ into so many vernaculars, carries with it a great deal more of danger than utility." On the other hand it is hard sometimes to relate his views of his own soul, or of human nature and life, to the sermon on the mount.

If the tolerant temper of a member of the ancient Church whose maternal ancestors were Jews and two of his brothers Protestants, finally led him to a certain indifferentism in regard to religious opinions and organizations, there was much in the hell on earth which raged in the name of religion around his quiet study to account for it. His contemporary, that stout Huguenot and fervent Protestant de la Noue, wrote: "The war cries were—For God—For the Gospel—and yet these children of the same God pursued each other with fire and blood like savage beasts. . . . It is our wars for religion which have made us forget religion."

Whatever may be true about Montaigne's real relations to formulas of belief, or ecclesiastical organizations, or even fundamental ethical attitudes, it is plain that he denounced with prophetic sincerity and vigour the outstanding vices of the terrible times in which he lived. For instance, in his essay entitled "Of Cannibals" he writes: "I conceive there is more barbarity in tearing limb from limb, by racks and tortures, a body still sensitive to pain, or in roasting it by degrees, or causing it to be worried by

dogs and swine (as we have but lately seen not amongst mortal enemies but amongst neighbours and fellow-citizens, and, what is worse, under color of piety and religion) than to roast and eat him after he is dead. . . . But there never was any opinion so evil as to excuse treachery, disloyalty, tyranny and cruelty, which are our familiar vices."

On one point in regard to Montaigne his many commentators are agreed: his mastery of style. This it is which, joined to shrewd common sense and a keen power of self analysis, has made his essays so interesting and charming to cultivated readers in many different lands and ages.

He is a writer apt to lose greatly in translation and his varied style is hard to suggest in extracts, but one of his most celebrated short passages is at the close of the essay entitled "That to Study Philosophy is to Learn to Die."

"I have often considered with myself how it comes about that in war the image of death, whether we look upon it as our own personal danger or that of another, should without comparison appear less dreadful than at home in our own houses (for if it were not so it would be an army of whining milksops); and that in spite of the fact that death is in all places the same, there should be, nevertheless, much more assurance in facing it among peasants and the meaner sort of people than in others of better quality and education. I do verily believe that it is the horrible ceremonies and preparations wherewith we set it out that terrify us more than the thing itself. An entirely new way of living, the cries of mothers, wives and children, the visits of astonished and afflicted friends, the attendance of pale and blubbering servants, a dark room, set round with burning tapers, our beds surrounded with physicians and divines; in short nothing but ghostliness and horror round about us, render it so formidable that a man almost fancies himself dead and buried al-

ready. Children are afraid even of those they have known most intimately and love best, when disguised in a mask and so are we; the mask must be removed from things as well as from persons; which being taken away, we shall find nothing underneath but the very same death that a lowly servant or a poor chambermaid died a day or two ago without any manner of apprehension or concern. Happy therefore is a manner of dying which deprives us of the leisure for such grand preparations!"

PERIOD 8

ABSOLUTISM BECOMES A VITAL ELEMENT OF FRANCE

From Peace with Spain and the Huguenots Until the Death of Louis XIV. 1598 to 1715

A. Henry IV.
B. Richelieu.
C. Mazarin.
D. The Economic Plans of Colbert.
E. Louis XIV.

Chapters XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XL.

CHAPTER XXXII

ABSOLUTISM BEGINS TO BE A VITAL ELEMENT OF FRANCE. HENRY IV

Four Frenchmen Henry IV, Richelieu, Mazarin, Louis XIV, resuming the long development of generations which had been interrupted by the reaction of the sixteenth century, helped mightily to make absolutism part of the life of France and the ideal of the European kings and kinglets who tried to imitate *Louis le Grand*. These four capable rulers made absolutism a vital element of France in a sense in which it never became a vital element of England and their brilliant example so entrenched it in the esteem of men who loved state craft, that it required fearful political and social convulsions to separate the doctrines and practise of absolutism from the history of France, and finally to dethrone the idea of the divine right of kings.

By the peace of Vervins and the Edict of Nantes, Henry IV gave France twelve years of peace at home and abroad, a rest which enabled her to survive past miseries and face those which were yet to come. Pietro Duodo, who was ambassador of Venice at Paris from 1595 to 1598, thus describes to the Venetian Senate the situation of France and its fundamental causes:

"By a long course of centuries the realm of France rose with the prosperous wind of marvellous fortune, aided by the prudence and skill of her kings, to that greatness which we have seen up to our own day. In ancient times, the territory of that realm was divided under the rule of many lords and during 546 years, some part of it was even held by the English. It was not, indeed, entirely united under the crown until the days of Charles VIII,

and Louis XII, who, marrying one after the other, Anne of Brittany, finally incorporated that duchy into the crown of France.

"After the establishment in Christendom of the extreme power of the House of Habsburg, the weaker princes desired good intelligence and friendship with this realm of France and used all efforts to preserve its power. The stronger ones, on the other hand, longed for the destruction of France in order to remove the only obstacle which prevented them from arriving at universal tyrannical control. From this latter feeling it came about that, during many years, these great princes did nothing else but try to abuse or destroy France; first by external war and then by civil and internal war. Therefore, although it seemed on the surface as if only the fate of this most noble realm was at stake, nevertheless, the truth was that France is the field of struggle on which it finally had to be decided whether or no the rest of Christendom must fall into miserable servitude.

"And although forty years ago, France had arrived at very great power, it was left by the three brothers who last wore its crown, in a condition where nothing remained but to deplore its hopeless fall. . . . After the death of Henry III, the kingdom was fairly rent asunder and showed no trace of its past splendour. It was full of wars, fire, blood, ambition, party spirit, dissension, suspicion, insolence, disobedience. Nothing was to be seen in the realm but horrible spectacles of barbarous cruelty, houses torn down, châteaux burnt, churches profaned, the very soil of the farms destroyed; in short, nothing left undone that the wildest fury of rage could do. . . .

"And if, during the first thirty years of these civil wars, when the Huguenots were the only opponents, it is estimated that 765,000 people perished (among them probably 60,000 gentlemen), nine cities were wiped out,

252 villages were burnt and more than 127,000 houses were destroyed, now one can affirm that, in the wars of the last ten years, four times as many are dead; because these wars were so barbarous and cruel that it can be truly said that there is no noble house in France wherein the father or the heir has not been killed, wounded or in prison. . . . Nevertheless God did not wish to abandon France in the depths of misery and so He gave her as King Henry IV. . . . And he is the only one today, who, by force and counsel, can bring back the all but vanished hope of the restitution of the realm to its pristine splendour."

To bring about this restoration which the Venetian Ambassador so confidently predicted, Henry IV had gaiety, tact, affability, shrewd common sense, an eye for picking men and will power. When it was necessary he could talk like the master he felt himself to be, but, he was in the highest degree what is meant in the slang of our politics by a "good mixer." He often decided things for himself, but he always took counsel. He had twelve intimate councillors who really directed the work of the administration; among them was no prince of the blood royal, no clergyman, no great noble. They were chosen among the lesser nobles, some of them from his old comrades in arms, and among the new nobility of the robe.

The most notable of the royal councillors was Maximilien de Bethune, afterwards Duke of Sully, second son of an ancient but rather poor line of country gentlemen. A Calvinist like his father, he had followed Henry during all his fighting. In 1596 the King, disgusted with the loose and unproductive management of the finances, made him Superintendent. Untrained in the traditional and complicated technicalities of accounting, he spent days and nights studying until the most skilful manipulator of figures could hardly hope to deceive him. He grew rich by the generosity of the King and his own

economy, but he was honest and imposed honesty on others. He became a veritable bulldog of the treasury and met with extraordinary success in restoring the finances.

When he took charge the receipts were only two-thirds of the expenses, the debts of the crown were thirty times its income and 45% of them were owed outside of France. Sully began to introduce order, insisting on an exact budget and strict accounting. He imposed an honest, rigorous administration which suffered neither waste nor cheating. He found the realm mortgaged and covered with debts. He left it solvent, with a treasure in gold in strong boxes and a larger balance in the hands of the treasurer.

Underneath this improvement of the finances of the state, there was an enormous gain in prosperity for the nation. In efforts to restore the prosperity of France the King took the lead. He was persuaded that the mulberry tree for feeding silk worms would flourish in all parts of the kingdom. He distributed 400,000 young trees and five hundred pounds of seed, together with 16,000 copies of a pamphlet on the care of silk worms.

To prevent gold from going out of the kingdom, he patronized the manufacture of articles of art and luxury; fine silks, gold thread for embroidery, fine glass ware, satins, damask and crapes, Flemish tapestry, eastern carpets and hangings of gilded and stained leather. No one of these enterprises to revive manufacture, maintain the balance of trade and help unemployment, were permanently successful. But the King took the lead and set the example in a mighty national effort for a remaking of France by that tireless industry and courageous hopefulness, which, in widely separated ages, has shown itself to be so characteristic of the French people.

Some of his efforts were directly and permanently successful. He made his superintendent of finances also the

first chief road-master of France. More than a hundred years before, the establishment of a system of royal posts had suggested more care for the roads and a beginning had been made of paving with square blocks of stone a narrow strip in the centre of national routes leading out of Paris. Henry II extended this paving and, along some routes, planted trees at intervals of 24 feet. In 1552 the first road book for any country was printed at Paris. It gave a road map, statistics about distances, information about the location of inns and even notes about where the wine was good. The efforts of Sully to restore and increase the highways and to build bridges were the beginnings of the intelligently directed skill which made France so long the leader of Europe in that department of national exertion. He began the system of interfluvial canals which has done so much for the prosperity of France and makes Paris today a great central port for water borne goods. His canal to unite the Seine and the Loire was two-thirds dug at his death.

Henry IV and Sully were especially interested in the restoration and improvement of the agriculture which still produces so large a part of the wealth of France. He undertook to drain swamps and brought Netherlanders into the kingdom to show the French how to do it. When a Calvinist country gentleman, Olivier de Serres, published, in 1600, his *Handbook of Agriculture and the Management of Farm Lands*, the King did his best to endorse and circulate the book, which was not only a treatise on farming, but a praise of country life. In his last chapter the writer quotes with enthusiasm Virgil's celebrated passage on the lot of the farmer. "Ah, farmers would be too happy if they but knew their blessings. Far from war and discord, earth of her own accord gives them an easy living. Though they have no palaces filled with dependents and splendid with luxury . . ., at least they enjoy repose free from care, a life which knows not

treacherous disappointment, a life rich in varied resources —at least they have peace in the wide spaces, the grottoes, the lakes of living water and the fresh valleys, the lowing cattle and soft slumber in the shade of a tree."

Henry IV was an enemy of the new social ideals which during the sixteenth century had been ruining the French gentry, not only by the waste of war, but by the advance of luxury and the change from a rural nobility living on their manors, to a court nobility mortgaging their estates (often at 30% interest) to live at court. Such an attitude on the part of a man, who from boyhood had been a soldier and a soldier who loved the game of war he played so well, showed a certain geniality and breadth which has made him, in the course of the centuries, perhaps the most popular of the French kings. On his good natured remark that he wished "every peasant family might have a fowl in the pot for Sunday dinner," his people have based a monument to him "more lasting than brass," by calling one of the most succulent products of French home cooking; "Chicken, Henry the Fourth." For the dish is like the onion soup of the French peasant of which one of our brilliant young writers (Willa Cather) says: "When one thinks of it a soup like this is not the work of one man. There are nearly a thousand years of history in this soup."

It is very difficult to say just why this shrewd King, who had given his people the inestimable benefit of twelve years of peace, after forty years of ruin and war, should, at the age of fifty-seven, have undertaken a war which was likely to renew the great duel between the Habsburgs and the House of France. His action was so hard to understand by his contemporaries, that scandalous tongues found for it an explanation which puts the great gray bearded king in a ridiculous light.

Henry IV had never allowed women to interfere seriously in affairs of state, but, all his life, they had made

more or less of a fool of him. When the fifteen year old daughter of the Constable of France, Charlotte de Montmorency, dancing in the court ballet of the nymphs of Diana, shook her arrow playfully at him, it is nothing new in the records of human folly among the wisest men, that the gouty King, forty years her senior, should have fallen desperately in love with her. The King arranged for her a marriage with the Prince of Condé and the Prince carried her off in a flight to the court of the Austrian Netherlands. Henry IV was furious; he acted and talked in such a silly way that he suggested the silly idea that he was going to war to force her back to France. But none except those who look on history as a continuous *Chronique Scandaleuse* will care to assume that Henry IV gave this foolish girl a power to interfere with his business as a ruler, which he had granted to none other of the easy beauties who had successively ruled what he called his heart.

Sully in his idle old age made a huge programme for the rearrangement of Europe which is called the *great design*. After the destruction of the menacing power of the Habsburgs, Europe was to be reorganized into six hereditary monarchies, six elective monarchies and three federated Republics; the Swiss, the Belgian, the North Italian. Calvinism, Lutheranism and Catholicism were to be freely practised everywhere. The Turk was to be driven from Europe and then perpetual peace was to be secured by a general European Council of forty members, sitting annually in each of the fifteen states, to compose all difficulties. It is in the highest degree improbable that Henry IV had ever adopted this political day dream of the leisure hours of the retired superintendent of his finances.

But Henry IV was not free from certain dislikes and fears widely prevalent among his contemporaries. The domains of the two branches of the House of Habsburg

encircled France. The Habsburgs had fomented the civil wars and finally used them as a pretext for an attempt to conquer France. Dutchmen and Englishmen had even better cause to hate the Spanish Habsburgs. The smaller powers, as the Venetian Ambassador wrote, were afraid of being destroyed by this colossus. The tension of jealousy and fear, eight years after the death of Henry IV, launched the Thirty Years' War and an abler statesman and more zealous Catholic than he, Cardinal Richelieu, was to throw the power of Catholic France on the Protestant side of that demoniac struggle. That Henry IV may have been adventurous in renewing when he did the attack on the old and dangerous enemy of France may be true. Richelieu afterwards thought so, but there were many reasons besides the Princess of Condé why he should have decided to do it.

He knew he was taking a risk and, on the eve of leaving Paris to put himself at the head of his northern army, he could not sleep. But he had no chance to show whether it was a winning or a losing risk. François Ravaillac, who had been a teacher in an elementary school, stabbed him as the royal carriage passed through a narrow street of Paris. The assassin was a feeble minded religious fanatic without accomplices. The clearest motive he could express was that "the King was about to make war against the Pope."

CHAPTER XXXIII

RICHELIEU, THE UNCROWNED RULER OF FRANCE. THE REVIVAL OF RELIGION. THE PRESS. THE SALON. THE ACADEMY.

The new King, Louis XIII, was not yet nine years old, and the princes of the blood were incompetent; so the King's mother, Marie de Medicis, appealed to the Parlement of Paris, which responded by unanimously declaring her regent. The princes of the blood royal, indignant at their exclusion from power, demanded a meeting of the Estates General, which assembled in 1614. But the disagreements between the orders were so sharp that the Estates could not act effectively, and the Assembly is notable only because it was the last Estates General to meet during one hundred and seventy-four years.

At the age of sixteen the King suddenly threw off the leading strings and sent his mother away from court. When she protested with sobs that she had always acted only in his interest, he replied that "he would always show himself a good son, but he wished to rule himself." That is just what he never did. He followed various counselors for some years, and, when he was twenty-three, he called into the royal council the man whose skill and will power gave to the French monarchy its final form.

Armand Jean du Plessis was the third son of François du Plessis, Lord of Richelieu, and the daughter of one of the leading lawyers of Paris. His father, when a young man, assassinated the assassin of his older brother and became one of the hardest fighters on the royal side in the Huguenot and League wars. The pride and violence of Richelieu's native temperament were as fairly representative of one side of his family inheritance, as his shrewdness and argumentative ability were of the other.

Henry IV, grateful for the father's loyal support, named Armand Jean, bishop of the little diocese of Luçon at the age of twenty-one. This was six years below the age fixed by the canon law, but he got a dispensation and consecration at Rome the next year. During six years he gave himself up to the reform and administration of his obscure diocese and then attracted public notice as orator of the Clergy in the Estates General of 1614. He became almoner to the Queen, passed into the service of the Queen Dowager, was made a cardinal and finally chief of the royal council. The King disliked him but had sense enough to know that Richelieu was making and keeping the throne great. For eighteen years, until minister and King died within a few months of each other, the Cardinal exercised the King's power by the King's consent, accumulated a huge fortune, married his nephews and nieces into the richest and most powerful families of France and lived with a state comparable to that of the royal court.

A modern English historian calls Richelieu "the greatest political genius France has ever produced." The reasons which might suggest so sweeping a judgment may be best set forth in short space by some extracts from the *Succinct Narration* which he revised. This is really Richelieu's apology for his own life but, in form, it is a glorification of the King. The skill with which the apology is presented under cover of praising the King is suggested by the following paragraph: "Those to whom history will make known the various sorts of difficulties which Your Majesty has encountered in all his great designs, because of the envy which his prosperity and the fear of his power has aroused in various foreign princes, because of the lack of good faith of some of his allies, and the perfidy of some of his evil subjects, because of his mother, always possessed by an evil spirit since the time when she distinguished her own interests from those of

the state,—the readers of history, I say, considering also the constitutional fickleness and the feebleness of the instruments whom you were compelled by necessity to employ in these affairs—among whom I take the first rank—taking all this into consideration—the readers of history will be obliged to acknowledge that nothing made up for the defects of the instruments except the excellent craftsmanship of Your Majesty who was the artisan."

Richelieu summarizes thus the achievements he afterwards describes in more detail. "When Your Majesty made up your mind to give me a large part of his confidence for the direction of his affairs, I can truly say that the Huguenots divided the state with Your Majesty, that the great nobles acted as if they were not your subjects and the most powerful governors of the provinces conducted themselves as if they were sovereigns of the charges committed to them; while the parlements were infected by this disorder and diminished, so far as it was possible, your legitimate authority in order to exalt their own over it . . . I promised Your Majesty then to use all my industry and all the authority which it might please you to give me, to ruin the Huguenot party, break down the pride of the great nobles, reduce all subjects to the obedience of a dutiful spirit and exalt the name of Your Majesty among foreign nations to the position it ought to occupy."

That this, his own statement of what he accomplished, is a fair one, no one would be disposed to deny.

To carry out his plans, both at home and abroad, he created a fleet which fought victoriously with the Spaniards and the English. Although Henry IV had not a single vessel, Louis XIII left over a hundred. He made the beginning of that new French army which, in the next generation, replaced the army of Spain as the best in Europe. He points out that for ten years the King occupied all the forces of his enemies by "putting the

hand into the purse and not on the sword hilt. All those years you helped the Dutch at least 1,200,000 livres a year, the Duke of Savoy more than a million, the King of Sweden a million, the Landgrave of Hesse a heavy subsidy, which was given also to many other princes when it seemed wise." But, when he actually took part in open war against the house of Habsburg in its German and Spanish branches, the King used at once two fleets and seven armies, amounting to one hundred and fifty thousand foot and thirty thousand horse which was for those days a huge force.

In the civil wars, the King's adversaries, were not all of the same tenacity. The party of the rebellious princes of the blood was badly led, and their lines were easily broken by the royal troops. But the Huguenots fought it out with the courage their forbears had shown and their bravest leader, afterwards became one of Richelieu's ablest generals.

In these wars, both civil and foreign, the Cardinal frequently took a very active part. To the hard fought siege of La Rochelle he contributed the great mole, which blocked the harbour against the relieving English fleet and compelled the starved burghers to accept pardon and the exercise of their "so-called reformed religion" at the price of giving up all their ancient franchises, rights and privileges and razing their fortifications. This rather bizarre combination of a prince of the Church and a commanding general of French armies, he made even more dramatically evident when he invaded Savoy. "He rode through the ford wearing a blue cuirass over a brown coat embroidered with gold and a plumed hat. Two pages rode before him, one carrying his gauntlets and the other his helmet, while, on each side, another page led a war charger by the bridle. When he reached the opposite bank he made his horse caracole a hundred times to show the army that he had been brought up as a soldier."

Richelieu had a great liking for pomp and splendour and, even when he was only bishop of a small see, he wrote to a friend to ask the price of two dozen silver plates of the proper size. "I should like to get them for 10,000 crowns, but I know you would not let me have anything insignificant for the sake of a few more crowns. I am a beggar as you know; but still, if I only had silver plates, my nobility would be much enhanced." This natural love of pomp grew upon him and, while it was undoubtedly a part of his politics, it also gave him intense pleasure. The same thing is true of the advancement and enriching of his family. He put them in high office because he wanted under him dependent creatures, but he also found keen delight in their rise in the social scale. His will forbade any member of his family to marry outside of "the true nobility"; by which he meant to exclude that nobility of the robe from which his own mother had come.

One reason why Richelieu accomplished so much was that he was an opportunist, who never hesitated to meet an emergency by an expedient not in accord with his fundamental judgments or his principles. Abstractly he was an admirer of the ancient nobility and blamed their replacement in the service of the state by the nobility of the robe. Practically he used them very little and depended for his most trusted agents upon his own family and especially on the clergy. His only really intimate counsellor was Father Joseph, a Capuchin friar.

His actions in repressing the nobility in spite of his abstract respect for noble blood, were all due to their unwillingness to submit to any sort of control. This it was which led him to forbid, on pain of death, duelling, which had reached such a pitch that in 1607 four thousand gentlemen were killed in duels. He writes of the young nobles who were by his orders beheaded for violating the royal edict against duels: "I confess I was never so

troubled in mind and I had great difficulty in keeping myself from yielding to the universal compassion which the fate of those two gentlemen excited in all hearts. . . . But the rivers of blood of your nobility which could not be checked without shedding theirs, gave me strength to confirm Your Majesty's resolution to send them to the scaffold for the benefit of the state."

He was a strong believer in the absolute right of kings, but he never hesitated to help rebels outside of France, and, though he was a sincere Catholic, he freely aided Protestant rebels against Catholic rulers. He sternly condemns the King of Spain for "trying to restore the Huguenot party and to make it stronger than ever, by means of a million livres the King bound himself to give them every year, thus making the Indies the tributaries of hell. . . . For Spain was not content with having patronized the revolts of the Huguenots against your predecessors, she has tried to make of them a state within your state. . . ." "I know that Spain tries to wash away the stain of so black an action by citing the aid you have given to the Dutch . . . but common sense leads all the world to recognize that there is a great difference between continuing an aid to the natural right of self defence, and a new establishment manifestly contrary to religion and the authority over their subjects which Kings have received from Heaven."

Any Spaniard might have been pardoned for failing to see the distinction which Richelieu says is so plain.

One of the most striking social phenomena of the first half of the seventeenth century in France was a revival of Catholicism; not simply as an opponent of Protestantism but as an active, positive religious force in men's actions, sentiments and thoughts. The result was that never perhaps since the early thirteenth century, did the clergy have as much influence in France from the top to the bottom of the social scale. A strong effort was made

to revive and reform old monastic orders and to found new ones. Within thirty years thirty-six convents and thirteen large churches were built in Paris.

A great effort was made also to found Catholic schools. In less than ten years after the Jesuits received permission to teach in Paris, they had over thirteen thousand pupils in their twelve colleges there and as many more in their colleges throughout the provinces. The Congregation of the Ursulines was active in founding girls' schools. These and similar institutions were to give Christian education to the laity. Other associations like the Oratorians, who had fifty establishments, endeavoured to improve the character and training of the priesthood.

Almost all the new orders or congregations founded, had, as a distinct object, some special, active charitable work; the opening of hospitals, the care of orphans or abandoned children, magdalen asylums, homes for incurables, the consolation of criminals condemned to row in the galleys, home nursing for the sick poor, etc. Many of these were associations of the laity, not bound by full monastic vows. The Order of the Mission was composed of priests bound by vow not to preach or administer the sacraments in big cities, in order that they might devote themselves to service in small and remote places served by ignorant or corrupt priests—where "the hungry sheep looked up and were not fed."

In this movement of revival which made religion potent for a time in all parts of the French social organization, two men stand out; one descended from wealthy, noble parents: the other born of poor parents in an obscure hamlet.

François de Sales was sent to Paris under care of a tutor and afterwards went to Italy to study law. He persuaded his father to let him enter the priesthood, and became coadjutor of the Bishop of Geneva—a bishop whose revenues were small while his cathedral city was held by

the Calvinists. At the age of thirty-five Francis went to Paris where the charm of his manner and the gentleness of his character caused him to be greatly loved. Henry IV was especially captivated by him and made him most flattering offers to remain. He preached before the King and in the principal churches of Paris and became "the true restorer of pulpit eloquence in France"; and French is the only literature in which sermonizers are ranked among the leading masters.

At the age of fifty, he published a book *The Introduction to the Devout Life,* which had an immediate success, was reprinted in uncounted editions and translated into all languages. It became the prayer book of the higher classes of French society and was to be seen everywhere on the dressing tables of noble ladies. Written in a graceful style and filled with metaphors and images, the very sincere interest of the writer in the salvation of souls shone out through the somewhat over elaborated pages. It appealed to people in society also because of its good form. Gentle and insinuating, free from roughness, it possessed in the eyes of gentlefolk the qualities of charm and distinction they sought to reach in their own manners. Here is a good example of its style "flavoured with honey." "In all your affairs rest entirely on the support of the providence of God by which alone your plans ought to succeed; on your part, however, work very gently with that providence. Act like little children who hold their father with one hand and with the other pick strawberries and blackberries along the hedgerows."

St. Vincent de Paul on the contrary found his work among peasants and among criminals in the galleys; for whom he founded a hospital at Marseilles. He also founded two asylums for abandoned children and was the inspirer of widespread organizations of merciful women who cared for the sick.

This movement of Catholic revival did not get its im-

pulse from the King or his council. It was, like so many of the most interesting movements in French history, not the result of government action, but a production of the vital energies of the nation appearing in the efforts of individuals. It was especially visible in its effects upon the higher circles of French society. It became the mode, as it is the mode in America now, for people of wealth and high social position to give money for humanitarian purposes. Though with our generation the custom is much more widespread and the amount given much greater: for, at no time and place in the history of the world has so much money been given for humanitarian, religious and educational purposes as has been given in the last fifty years in the United States.

Richelieu was a faithful Catholic and he rejoiced in the triumphs of his church. But he was a Frenchman as well as a Catholic and practically he could never decide that it was his duty to let his zeal for the Papal authority act to the disadvantage of the King of France. His was the attitude, taken by many men of many nations both before and after him, which the Roman curia has found it so hard to accept as a psychological fact—the attitude which refuses to accept the decisions of "spiritual men when they claim authority in temporal affairs."

For Richelieu reasons of state prevailed in matters of state. He wrote with reference to making alliance with the German Protestants against Catholic Spain: "Difference of beliefs do not make us citizens of different states. Though divided in faith we remain united in a prince for whose service no Catholic is so blind as to look on a Spaniard as better than a French Huguenot in matters of state."

When he broke the power of the Huguenots, he was not acting from religious zeal but for political reasons; when he had entirely destroyed the Huguenot state within the state and levelled the walls of La Rochelle, he con-

firmed the freedom of religious worship granted by Henry IV in the Edict of Nantes. He was interested in efforts for their conversion, but he refused to allow the use of force. He left them with no protection for the toleration granted to them except the good faith of the rulers of France. But it is difficult to see how, with his ideal of a unified France resting on the power of the King, he had any alternative. It is still more difficult to see how he can be blamed because, years after he was dead, a bigoted King began a cruel persecution.

This attitude of refusing to allow his religious sympathies to interfere with his statecraft, naturally made him a personage not very agreeable to most of the popes he knew, and other things made him disliked in France. He was proud and reserved, anxious not only for the realities of power but for the show of power, and it was his habit to leave a room before every one but the King; which caused his own uncle to say, after Richelieu had taken precedence of the heir-apparent of the Duchy of Savoy: "Who would have thought that the grandson of the lawyer LaPorte would ever come to precede the grandson of the Emperor Charles V."

A certain hardness grew upon him. He ruled more and more with a hand of iron and came to use, more and more, judgement by special commission which overlooked entirely the regular courts of justice. By such temporary tribunals, a sort of civil court martial where he could be sure of a verdict of guilty, he sent to the scaffold five dukes, four counts, a marshal of France and the King's favourite equerry. These men were guilty either of conspiracy against the King's will or against Richelieu's influence and he wrote: "In any matter of crime against the state, the door must be closed to pity."

There were certain things that Richelieu, with all his power of work and his skill, did not do. While he used every effort to extend and defend French commerce, he

did not follow the example of Henry IV and Sully in their care for agriculture and manufactures. The internal prosperity of France did not increase and no broad attempt was made to readjust the growing burden of taxation which provoked a number of local insurrections. These generally began with the murder of tax collectors and ended with the shooting and hanging of a number of the rebels.

The one thing which Richelieu conspicuously failed to do was to reform the finances. The budget was not balanced—secrecy of accounting was not broken up, the evil of the sale of offices continued, no attempt was made to attack the salt monopoly or the farming of taxes. He thus left in the monarchy a secret ulcer which, a hundred and fifty years after his death, helped to destroy it.

In the latter part of the sixteenth century, during the reigns of the son and three grandsons of Francis I, the King, in spite of his theoretically unlimited authority, was never the outstanding personality in France. The Constable Anne de Montmorency, Admiral Coligny, Francis Duke of Guise and later his son Henry,—these seemed, both inside and outside the kingdom, greater than their sovereigns. With Henry IV this changed. He was large enough for his position and, both within France and in Western Europe, he was the first personage of his day. Richelieu again over-shadowed his royal master. To an extent not true of any other man in the history of France, he was her uncrowned ruler. But the condition of his power was his ability to persuade Louis XIII that he wanted Richelieu to do what Richelieu had already decided ought to be done.

For continuing the work of Henry IV and restoring the unity of France, Richelieu had no choice of institutions on which he could base the state. The Estates General was an assembly of jealous classes each absorbed in its own narrow interests. It was entirely unfitted to be-

come, what the English parliament became during the seventeenth century, the foundation of the state. If Richelieu wanted to unify France and give her the leadership in Europe, he was obliged to stand by the ancient tradition which made the king absolute in theory and realize it by making the king all powerful in fact. Loyalty and not liberty had to be the keynote of his work.

Few statesmen have been more successful; for the vision he followed was realized during the reign of Louis XIV, when the development of ancient France reached its climax and set free all the energies of the nation in a dazzling display of power under the impulse and control of a loyalty so overmastering that it made Frenchmen forget for a time the love of liberty.

Richelieu with all his conservatism was extremely farsighted. He was one of the first rulers to recognize the importance to an absolute government of supplying and controlling the news. From 1611, the French *Mercury* had been issued at Paris to give, annually, a summary of the chief events of the year and a weekly journal had been published at Frankfort and another at Antwerp. *The Mercury* had been supplemented later by fugitive sheets printed from time to time. In 1631, a few years after his accession to power, Richelieu gave to a well known physician his patronage for the *Gazette de France;* a small weekly publication for which the government supplied the news. Both the King and the great minister wrote not infrequently for it.

How well Richelieu understood the use of propaganda is shown by this paragraph, which followed the news of his victory in the affair of Mantua. "Thus has been dissipated the great storm which seemed to threaten all the world and appeared to be about to take from France her lilies, from Mantua her fortresses, from Italy her liberties, from the French nobility its glory, from all Europe her freedom. Thus the Germans and Spaniards have

come to Italy and left it with more shame than profit." A great French historian (Henri Martin) remarks on the fact that this great apostle of absolutism used as a devoted servant the press which was to become—and notably in France—the most dangerous enemy of absolutism.

With one French institution, the *Salon,* which began under his rule, Richelieu had nothing to do. In 1624 the Marquise de Rambouillet, Italian on her mother's side, began to receive regularly at receptions in her mansion at Paris, royal princes, members of the aristocracy, and men of any descent who possessed wit and skill in the use of language. During twenty-four years her friends met for the pleasures of society; the chief of which they found in conversation and the reading of new books—though music and dancing were not excluded. Madame de Rambouillet and her friends had great power. They exalted the pleasures of the mind, they exercised a refining influence upon manners, they helped to keep the language pure, they made or unmade literary reputations. Above all this series of receptions at the mansion of a clever and well read Marquise marked a stage in the development of that art of witty and refined conversation in which the French have been generally conceded to be the leaders of the world. A *Salon* is something distinctively French often imitated in other countries, but seldom reproduced.

One other celebrated French literary and social institution is closely associated with Richelieu: The French Academy. In its origin this was a sort of masculine and burgher *salon.* About the year 1635, a little group of cultivated Parisians, men of the burgher circles of society, were accustomed to meet once a week at the house of one of their number to talk of the news of the day—but more especially of literature. Richelieu, who heard of this from one of the group, asked if they would not form an association to meet regularly under public authority. After some

hesitation they accepted the suggestion and were established by royal letters patent as the *Academie Française,* with forty members. Cardinal Richelieu was their chief and protector. Their object, as defined by their statutes, was to guard the purity of the French language, to give it fixed rules, to render it eloquent and usable for the discussion of the arts and sciences; in short to make it the most perfect of modern tongues. The first task the Academy undertook was to produce a national dictionary, to be followed by a grammar, a treatise on poetry and a rhetoric.

The list of its members lacks the names of some of the greatest writers of French during the nearly three hundred years since it was founded, but the English historian Hallam, in the middle of the last century, could call it, despite that fact, "the most illustrious institution which has ever existed in the realm of letters." Four other academies have grown up around it; Inscriptions and Belles Lettres, Fine Arts, Natural Sciences, Moral and Political Sciences. At the beginning of the nineteenth century these were all organized as the Institute of France and there is no honour more coveted by Frenchmen than membership in that body.

CHAPTER XXXIV

MAZARIN, THE CRAFTY ITALIAN WHO RULED FRANCE NINETEEN YEARS.

The death of Louis XIII a few months after the death of his great minister, left the crown to a child, Louis XIV, who was not yet five years old. By the will of the late King his wife Anne was to be regent, but seven named councillors were to decide all important questions. The Parlement of Paris unanimously accepted the statement of the King that his mother should be regent without limits on her power. Apparently that highest court of the realm decided that the voice of the King, however much of a child he might be, had more authority than the last will of his father who had ceased to be King by dying.

The little King's mother was a Spaniard fifty years old: a handsome woman who dressed well. She had the dignified bearing and manners which could be learned at the Spanish court and her son's later love for exaggerated ceremonial may have been due to her early influence. A great modern French historian has pointed out that very few of the Kings of France were full-blooded Frenchmen; they had foreign mothers under whose care they spent their most impressionable years. This may be the simple explanation of the fact that some of them showed at times that they preferred dynastic interests to national interests, fought frequently futile wars or feasted sumptuously like the rich man while the beggar Lazarus lay at the gates covered with sores. Louis XIV certainly did all these things. Indeed, none of the last four kings who wore the crown from 1610 to 1789 made any strong and consistent effort to do the things most manifestly necessary for the welfare of that France which they and their predecessors did so much to bring into being as a unified state.

Martin Luther said: "Germany is a magnificent horse which needs only a rider." To consider the output of French national energy in enduring the miseries of war and gaining the glorious conquests of peace, is to see that France, a century after Luther's death, was also a magnificent horse. Absolute kings and their ministers—more absolute perhaps than any similar series of European sovereigns have ever been—were firmly in the saddle and during one hundred and seventy-nine years, they demonstrated their incapacity to ride.

The Queen Regent spent many hours in her chapel and gave money freely to churches. She made an excellent figurehead for the state, but she was lazy and rather dull. "No one including herself thought her capable of ruling France." However, there was nobody else in the royal family more capable of being regent than she was. The late King, the day after Richelieu's death, had followed his advice to make Mazarin prime minister and Queen Anne did the best thing she could do in continuing to lean on Mazarin. He became the uncrowned King of France and the simplest explanation of certain passages in the correspondence between him and the Queen Mother is that they were lovers.

Jules Mazarin was the son of a majordomo of the great Italian family of Colonna. Jules served the family as chamberlain and captain of infantry. He then took a degree in law, became a diplomatic agent of the Pope and was finally sent to Paris as nuncio. He entered into the service of Richelieu, became a naturalized Frenchman and, on the nomination of the French crown, was appointed a cardinal. He accumulated a fortune which made that of Richelieu seem small. That he did this with entire honesty is impossible, but the dishonesty was never evident in detail and many of his essentially dishonest expedients were condoned by custom.

He depended less on force and more on craft than his

great predecessor. His manners were more insinuating and his methods subtler. But he had a deep knowledge of the bad side of human nature and used it skilfully. He suffers by too close proximity to Richelieu, which makes him seem smaller than he was. In foreign affairs he carried to a triumphant conclusion the policy he inherited from his master—that France should break the power of the Habsburgs by assuming the lead of the Protestant party in the Thirty Years War.

The inheritance had nearly proved one of disaster, for, at the death of Richelieu, the Spanish army was threatening to invade France and attack Paris. But the dying Louis XIII put the son of the Prince of Condé (the first prince of the blood royal) in command of the last army which stood between France and ruin. A celebrated passage in Bossuet's funeral oration over the Great Condé describes the result:

"So in the early years of the King's reign (Louis XIV) the Duke d'Enghien conceived at the age of twenty-two years a design to which experienced old men could not attain; but victory before Rocroi justified his daring. True, the enemy's army was stronger; it was made up of those veteran regiments Walloon, Spanish, Italian, which, up to that time, no one had ever been able to break. But for how much must not one count the courage breathed into our troops by the terrible need of the state and a young prince of the blood who carried victory in his eyes?

"Don Francesco de Mellos firmly awaits the attack and it seems as if the two generals and the two armies had deliberately shut themselves up in a circle of woods and marshes without the power of withdrawing; like two brave men who have chosen to settle their quarrel within the barriers of the lists. What a spectacle is before our eyes? The young prince seemed to be another man. His soul, inspired by an object worthy of its greatness, showed all its power, his courage grew with the peril and his in-

telligence brightened with his ardour. During the night, which had to be passed in the presence of the enemy, like a watchful captain, he was the last to sleep; but he never slept more peacefully and it is well known that, in the morning, this second Alexander had to be roused from deep sleep. Do you see him as he flies to victory or death? As soon as he had spread from rank to rank the ardour which animated him, one sees him almost simultaneously drive the right wing of the enemy, sustain ours which was shaken, rally the half-beaten French, put to flight the victorious Spaniard. . . . But there was left that formidable infantry of the army of Spain, whose great battalions, with serried ranks, remained unshakable in the midst of the rest of the routed army; like great towers pouring out a heavy fire on all sides: but they were towers able to repair their own breaches. Three times the young victor tried to break these intrepid fighters, three times he was repulsed by the brave Count of Fontaines, whom one could see carried in his chair and showing, in spite of his infirmities, that a soldier's soul is master of the body it animates.

"But finally it was necessary to give ground. In vain Bek hastens his march across the forest to fall upon our exhausted troops. The Prince has anticipated the manœuvre; the broken battalions demand quarter. . . . The Prince would gladly have saved the life of the brave Count of Fontaines, but he was down among the thousands of dead whose loss Spain still feels. She did not know that the prince who made her lose so many of her veteran regiments on the field of Rocroi would finish off the rest of them on the plain of Lens." (Five years later.)

Spain lost that part of her military power which rested on her army and its reputation. The French army became the leading army of Europe and this fact helped the skilful Mazarin to conduct with success the intricate negotiations which, in 1648, ended the Thirty Years War by

the peace of Westphalia. By this peace, Sweden, whom France had so long sustained, obtained a large indemnity and territory which gave her control of the Baltic. France received territories in Alsace which gave her a good military frontier. Calvinism was placed on equal legal terms with Lutheranism in the Empire. The independence of Switzerland and of the United Netherlands, long practically maintained, was theoretically acknowledged. The power of the Emperor and the Diet was all but entirely destroyed and about three hundred and fifty states of the Empire became their own masters; while their princes became absolute sovereigns in them. France and Sweden, as guarantors of this peace, received the right to interfere in the affairs of the Empire.

This peace left France plainly occupying that leading position in Europe which Spain had occupied during the sixteenth century. The Bourbon had at last beaten the Habsburg.

But the older branch of the Habsburgs did not know it was beaten, for war continued with Spain during eleven years more. It came to an end in 1659 with the peace of the Pyrenees, by which Dunkirk was given to England as the stipulated price for the alliance of Oliver Cromwell, and a marriage was arranged between the eldest daughter of the King of Spain and the young French King. The Salic law, which, in France, prohibited the inheritance of the crown through the distaff side, did not exist in Spain. This marriage, therefore, rendered it possible for a King of France to inherit the crown of Spain: a possibility which bred international suspicion.

The foreign policy of Mazarin was highly successful in the sense that it achieved a large part of the objects it proposed to achieve. There are, however, historians who are inclined to consider him a man in whom love of the game of dynastic diplomacy on the international chessboard was stronger than the love of France. Lavisse

writes: "The marriage of Louis XIV with the oldest daughter of the King of Spain was in truth nothing but a brilliant affair. Mazarin allowed himself to be deceived by that brilliance and preferred the glory of the dynasty to the interests of the realm, which was an enormous error. Undoubtedly Richelieu would not have committed it, for he was a native born Frenchman."

Mazarin provoked and mastered a revolt which was called the Fronde. Its name indicated that it was not very serious or taken very seriously; for Fronde was the name of a game the boys played in the streets of Paris in spite of the efforts of the police to stop it. Its beginning, however, seemed serious and respectable.

After five years of Mazarin's rule, the parlement of Paris presented a charter to the Regent which asserted among other things the right of consent to taxation and the right of habeas corpus. Mazarin and the Queen Regent accepted most of the articles of the charter, but, strengthened by the news of the great victory of Lens, ordered the arrest of one of the chief leaders of the opposition, Broussel; who had been a member of Parlement since the days of Henry IV. His poverty, his incorruptibility, his learning, made the venerable judge extremely popular. As soon as the news of his arrest went abroad, barricades rose all over Paris and the people spent the night in the streets. The next day when the burgher militia was called out they mustered shouting Vive Broussel! and even the French royal guards said they would not fire on the people. So the order was given to set Broussel free and a royal declaration confirmed the charter. Two months later the court left Paris at night and went to St. Germain.

The civil war began when certain great lords and princes of the blood raised the standard of a revolt, whose battles were mainly verbal. Mazarin took the King through the disaffected provinces and the sight of the

boy was more efficient than his army in bringing about submission. All the insurgents protested that they were loyal to the King and only revolting against Mazarin, who was denounced as "one who does not love France." Parlement even put a price of 50,000 crowns on his head. He distributed enormous bribes to the leading Frondeurs, practically all they asked, and the faction was broken up more by gold than by arms. When compared with the serious passion of the great English contemporary struggle between loyalty and liberty, the incurable egotism of the spasmodic and chaotic Fronde seems amply to deserve the name given it in mockery by its contemporaries.

The collapse of the reaction of the Fronde left Mazarin, by virtue of the authority he received from the young King and his mother, the master of France perhaps more absolutely than Richelieu ever was. The Queen Regent loved him and the King was fonder of him than any one else except his mother; whereas Richelieu had been detested by the Queen and the Queen Dowager and only tolerated as a disagreeable necessity by the melancholy and cold-blooded Louis XIII.

The second great cardinal minister combined with avarice a love of sheer spendthrift display which often goes with the greediness of the self-made parvenu. One of the princesses of the blood royal wrote: "I think such magnificence as his has never been seen in France." Once he distributed among the courtiers, gratuitously, tickets for a lottery whose prizes amounted to the huge sum of a million francs and his nieces were in the habit of throwing handfuls of gold pieces out of the windows of his palace, in order to watch the valets fight for them in the court. He gave magnificent fêtes and card playing was to him what hunting was to most kings and nobles. He played for large stakes and often spent whole afternoons gambling. But he refused to give the young Queen, in spite of the urging of the Queen Regent, the money which

would enable her to join in the games. Indeed, it is remarkable that the King, to whom Mazarin gave comparatively little money, did not resent the more than royal splendour of the life led in the *Palais Mazarin*, crowded with the most costly collections of objects of art and luxury.

On the occasion of the Queen's entry into Paris, Mazarin could not appear because he was ill, but he was represented by a train which suggests the entry of a modern circus into a small city; except that the gold and silver, the silk and satin, were real and not tinsel or rayon. The Venetian Ambassador describes it for us. "First came seventy-two mules guided by twenty-five men in livery. Twenty-four of the mules were covered with embroidered red cloth, an equal number had very beautiful caparisons of tapestry and the rest were covered with crimson velvet richly embroidered with gold and silver. The harness ornaments of these mules were massive plaques of gold and silver and each of them wore a huge plume of red and white feathers. Then came the chief groom with twenty-four pages richly dressed and riding fine horses. Then twelve grooms led twelve superb horses with housings of crimson velvet. Behind these came cavaliers in the livery of the Cardinal, guarding eleven six-horse carriages, preceding a smaller coach drawn by eight magnificent horses. This chief coach, although empty, was guarded by fifty noble cavaliers with horses, caparisons and clothes of incredible costliness. The train was closed by a hundred mounted musketeers of the guards of His Eminence, wearing crimson cloaks with silver ornaments and many red and white plumes in their hats."

CHAPTER XXXV

LOUIS XIV. THE ECONOMIC PLANS OF COLBERT.

At the death of Mazarin, Louis XIV undertook the government of France. When he died in his seventy-eighth year, he had worn the crown for seventy-two years; the longest reign of any great sovereign in the history of Europe. This long life spent on the throne may be divided into three periods. First, the period before the death of Mazarin, when, at twenty-three, he took the helm of state. Second, the period of his rule up to the time of his religious conversion at about the age of forty. Third, the remaining thirty-five years in his life, which were years of declining prestige in the world. During all these three stages the King remained the same man. His fundamental ideas about kingship appear at the very beginning of his use of power and though conversion changed his habits it did not change his heart.

Within a few hours of the Cardinal's death, Louis XIV ordered the secretaries and the chancellor to sign or seal nothing without his orders and the King never again became a cipher in council or a mere figurehead for the government. Indeed towards the end of the reign he took the helm as entirely into his own hands and steered the ship of state as continuously, as Richelieu or Mazarin.

Louis XIV had received very little education out of books. He was ignorant, for instance, even of the history of France. But his strong practical common sense had been practised in matters of state. He had been often in the active army, where he had sat in counsels of war and learned from his great general Turenne. He was competent to direct siege operations and, though in no sense a general like his grandfather, Henry IV, he was

not incapable of making an intelligent choice between different strategical plans. Mazarin had trained him in diplomacy in the false and subtle school of the times, based on an intimate knowledge of the lower side of human nature. He was as unscrupulous in playing fast and loose with his word of honour pledged in treaties and as shameless about lying for reasons of state as many rulers before and after him. His long observation and silence had made him complete master of his feelings. Unlike many great personages, he talked little and guardedly. Nor did he find it difficult to mask beneath an exquisite and unvarying politeness, his contempt for human nature and his suspicious distrust of all men.

Machiavelli says there are three kinds of men who engage in affairs of state: "One man understands of himself, another understands what is explained, and the third sort understands neither of himself nor by any explanation." Louis XIV was of the second class, for his intellectual ability was mediocre. But he was a great reader of reports and found actual pleasure in presiding over meetings of councils. It was not impossible to persuade him that the ideas of others were his own. But his mind was all but hermetically sealed by self esteem against noble and generous thoughts; even when they came from faithful servants. The misery of his people never suggested any real efficient regret for his ceaseless warlike ambition and no lasting impulse to lessen the costly splendour of his court. He possessed, however, a strong will, capacity to understand advice, the eye of a king to pick capable men, and regular, tireless industry; traits which are enough to make an efficient ruler.

His strongest natural bent was towards pride, which, fed by such adulation as has been offered to no other ruler outside of Asia, became a mental disease of "infatuation with himself" which wrought effects more devastating than a passion for alcohol or drugs. He had many

tastes and did many things, but he said himself that his great passion was for military glory. In those days many rulers naturally turned to war as a normal exercise of energy. Even Oliver Cromwell, finding himself commander of a fleet and a highly trained army, assumed that his only choice was whether he should fight France or Spain. It seems never to have occurred to him that there was another choice—not to fight at all.

Louis XIV never ceased playing the king from the moment he woke in the morning until the moment he fell asleep at night and war was to him the background of that pose of a conqueror which, of all his poses, pleased, him most. But he was never in his heart really a soldier. When he went for a few weeks to the camp which was besieging some city, it was not in order to share the hardship and monotony of the lives of his men. He took with him as much of the luxury and splendour of his court as was possible. Nor did he, like his grandfather and his father, expose his life, leading charges sword in hand. This was neither cowardice nor effeminacy. He had too much self control to yield to fear or to become a slave to habit. It was the calm assumption that his life was too precious to be risked and his gilded dignity too sacred ever to be forgotten.

Louis XIV inherited from Mazarin a corps of experienced councilors and administrators. Among them was Nicholas Fouquet, who had been for eight years superintendent of finances and had increased his fortune until it was even greater than that of Mazarin; on whom in times of great stress for money he could bring to bear disagreeable pressure. So the two, originally friends, quarrelled. The death of Mazarin brought Fouquet to grips with another enemy who had once been his political ally. Jean Baptiste Colbert was descended from a merchant family of Rheims, and, about the time of the King's birth, entered into public service. He became Mazarin's

right hand man and, shortly before the Cardinal's death, gave him a memoir containing a plan of financial reform and an attack on Fouquet. It was probably at Colbert's instigation that the young King determined to bring Fouquet to justice; though the regal splendour of the fête given to the King by the financier in his magnificent country palace added anger to the King's distrust. After a four years' trial he was found guilty and spent the last fifteen years of his life in a very harsh imprisonment.

The accounts were in so chaotic a condition that it was difficult to find legal proof either to acquit or condemn. Some writers on French law consider the trial a monument of illegality, but the editor of Colbert's correspondence asserts that it is made "clear as daylight by a multitude of documents which have come down to us, that Fouquet was a shameless peculator." There was of course a large amount of hypocrisy in the whole affair; for Richelieu, Mazarin and most of their counselors had made fortunes too rapidly to permit us to regard them as properly fitted to act as censors of probity. Fouquet, a reckless exaggerator, was offered as a scapegoat for an inveterate and complicated system essentially dishonest.

Louis XIV had very clear ideas about the sort of men he wanted to help him administer the government of France. He had received the state from two cardinals but he wanted no great ecclesiastics in his intimate councils; their red robe might become a shelter for them. Neither did he want any princes or great nobles, but men made by him, whose prosperity depended entirely on his favour: men to whom the fate of Fouquet might serve as an object lesson. Louis XIV paid great honour to the nobility. They were called in proclamations "the right arm of the King," and "the firmest support of the throne." He himself was proud of the title "the first gentleman of France." But he used the aristocracy only as figureheads for provincial governments without real power, or to fill

the higher offices of the Church, or as officers for the army or as soldiers in the royal guards.

His largest use of them, however, was to make up the crowd which, like the mob or the chorus at the opera, formed the background for the continuous performance of the great spectacle of the apotheosis of the King, which was the daily occupation of those who crowded the gorgeous royal caravansary at Versailles. The law forbade nobles to enter into business or handicrafts, they were free from land taxes, but unable to do anything but vegetate on their impoverished estates; unless indeed ruinous mortgages enabled them to go to court and "wear their mills, forests and meadows on their backs."

Among the councilors the King inherited, there was one much greater than the others: Colbert. Indeed, it is not impossible to rank him along with Richelieu and Mazarin. Less capable than the first and less subtle than the second, he was more original than either. He presented to his King a new and genial idea: that the King should take as his principal object making France rich. For money, he went on to say, is the guarantee of peace and the sinews of war. If France, he wrote in memoirs intended for the King's eyes, develops her latent riches, that will make her the dominant and leading nation of the world; and he illustrated his claim by the history of Venice, Holland and Spain. If the King had heartily accepted this idea not only his reign but the history of France might have been changed.

As it was, he let Colbert have his way for a time without taking any real interest in his plans. But, after five years, the King began to insure the failure of the whole undertaking by beginning the intermittent wars which filled the remaining years of his reign. Even before that he had begun to divert the wealth of France into the ruinous splendours of Versailles; where he changed a desert into the most stately park in the world, built the

largest palace in Europe,[1] and led a life of an extravagance which had not been surpassed except by the spendthrift emperors of Rome.

In spite of the lack of peace and economy to accumulate the capital he needed, Colbert, who was an incessant worker, applied himself with enormous vigour to the realization of his ideal. He undertook at first the reform of the finances which he had vainly recommended to Mazarin. He convicted Fouquet and made a valiant effort at a general reform of taxation and administration; although he was not able to attack such fundamental evils as the farming of taxes and the sale of offices. But at the end of the first six years, when the two passions of the King, for glory and for magnificence, had not begun to produce their most disastrous effects, Colbert had imitated Sully by changing a deficit in the budget into a surplus.

More and more power came into his hands; he was controller general of finances, secretary for the marine, for industry and commerce and superintendent of royal buildings; which was equivalent to minister of fine arts. He used this authority in the effort to make France the leader of Europe—not by arms but by industry. The expansion he tried to get was imposed from above and too much directed by rules; like everything else in a reign whose home policy came to be progressively absorbed in the glorification of obedience. He was terribly handicapped by the wars and the extravagance of the King, which used up the capital he needed while at the same time crushing business expansion by heavy taxation. But nevertheless "his effort was nowhere useless."

That effort was very broad and great. He reported to the King that the commerce of the world was carried by twenty thousand vessels, of which Holland owned between fifteen and sixteen thousand, England between

[1] The Escorial contained a monastery and a seminary

three and four thousand and France between five and six hundred. He began shipbuilding and he found his materials in France. For example, he regulated the forests to supply timber and brought workmen from Sweden to show Frenchmen how to extract tar and pitch. So he formed a merchant marine and built to protect it a navy which, from the hemp of its ropes to the bronze of its cannon, was a product of France. Mazarin had allowed the navy to shrink to a few small ill found ships. Colbert rebuilt the port and arsenal of Toulon and founded new ones like that at Brest, where he enlarged a hamlet of fifty fishermen into a city of six thousand inhabitants. Thus he created before his death a fleet of two hundred and seventy-six vessels large and small and ten years later his shipyards and arsenals had so increased the fleet that it could be matched against the fleet of England.

To furnish ladings for his merchant ships he proposed to make in France everything which France bought in England, Holland or elsewhere and then to sell the surplus to other countries. This would draw money into France, for, according to the prevalent ideas of his day, he measured national prosperity by money.

It is estimated that France had then about twenty million people. Colbert was extremely anxious to increase the population. At one time he abolished taxes for every family of ten or more children on condition that no one of them should become a monk or a priest and he granted suspension of taxes to men who married by twenty years of age.

There arose a hierarchy of manufactures called into being by the state. The King was direct owner of a certain number of establishments, at whose head was the Gobelins. These *Manufactures du Roi* made his carriages, his boats for the canal at Versailles, his magnificent furniture in silver and rare woods. Below this class came more than a hundred royal manufactures of

fine Dutch cloth—Flemish tapestries at Beauvais, Venetian glass, etc. Of these the King was a direct patron: he contributed to their first establishment and gave them for a time a monopoly with exemption from taxes. Their workmen were naturalized without fees and they had the right to put the King's arms above their doorways.

To organize production Colbert sent men down to various cities which possessed no industries. He provided capital; frequently subscribed by officers of the administration, who bought stock to please the powerful minister. He had the King issue a series of thirty-eight regulations and one hundred and fifty edicts related to the details of organization and production. He created out of competent men a corps of inspecting commissioners to see that the regulations were followed and to burn all badly made goods. But he never had enough money to do what he wanted to do.

He accomplished much for transportation and was the true organizer of the present French Bureau of Bridges and Highways. It was his order to "consider the great road which leads from a province to Paris as the principal road"; which was a powerful influence in bringing about the present centralization of French transportation in Paris. He was particularly active in canalization, which is still so important in French transportation. His most notable achievement was the so-called canal of the two seas which, by connecting the Mediterranean and the Atlantic, realized a plan discussed since the sixteenth century. He originally wished to have it capable of playing the part played in our naval defense by the Panama Canal and he could have made it deep enough for this with a portion of the money spent on Versailles.

He found commerce at a low ebb. The trade with the French colonies was in the hands of foreigners. The central markets of the fur trade of Canada were at London and Amsterdam. Even the trade from the French

West Indies in sugar, cotton, tobacco and the fine woods for the great French cabinetmakers like André Boulle was largely in Dutch hands.

Colbert regarded commerce as a struggle for the possession of a certain fixed quantity of trade in the world and felt that what one nation gained others must lose. To carry on this commercial war against the rivals of France, he followed the example set by Englishmen and the Dutch by founding or reviving national companies to exploit the commerce of the world; the Company of the North for the Baltic, the Compagnies of the Levant and the East Indies for the Mediterranean and Asia, the Company of the West Indies for Africa and America. He even discussed a Suez canal. The King, the Queens and the court bought shares in these companies and they were recommended in a very pressing manner to state officials, but, in spite of the distribution of fictitious dividends, the subscription was looked on as a new sort of disguised taxation. None of these companies was really successful; partly from lack of capital and partly because they were too much government affairs. Even in a commercial nation like ours the government does not seem to be very successful in running profitably railroad or steamship lines.

Colbert was very attentive to the administration of the French colonies of North America and the West Indies. He was particularly anxious to increase the population of Canada and soldiers who would not marry within fifteen days of the arrival of the shiploads of young girls he sent out, were harshly punished. He wished to civilize the Indians and amalgamate them into one people with the white settlers. This the Jesuit missionaries opposed, because they believed their converts would be corrupted by the white Christians. They also objected to the purchase of furs from the Indians in exchange for liquor, saying that, in addition to destroying the souls of the Indians, it

made them lazy trappers. The fur traders replied that, on the contrary, it made them more eager to collect furs which they could trade for the pleasure of getting drunk. Colbert leaned to the side of the traders and pointed out, in a letter to the bishop, that if the orthodox French did not trade liquor for furs the Indians would get just as much from the English and Dutch and imbibe heresy with their drink. In spite of all difficulties, for the French are reluctant to emigrate, the population of Canada increased under Colbert's administration from twenty-five hundred to ten thousand, while in the Antilles the population doubled.

The intrepid and resourceful La Salle explored the Mississippi, and France seemed to control the best part of North America by her hold on the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi, flowing east and south from that strategic centre. It was an empire whose defense, if Louis XIV had known it, was worth postponing the attempt to acquire a more complete hegemony in Europe.

For the small success of his economic effort Colbert blamed the lack of money and he did not fail to point out to his master the causes of that lack. He says in a memoir for the King, written five years after Mazarin's death, that at a time when terrible sufferings and losses have fallen on the peasants in the provinces, the King has tripled the size of his stables and spent large sums on furniture. "'It appears to me," he continues, "that Your Majesty is commencing to prefer his pleasures and amusements to everything else, and this at a moment when the money affairs of Your Majesty are falling into an abyss of necessity."

CHAPTER XXXVI

COLBERT'S USE OF ART AND LETTERS. THE KING'S MISTRESSES AND EXTRAVAGANCE

Colbert did not propose to found the glory of Louis XIV on wealth alone. He planned to use art and letters directly in the continual glorification of the King by medals, paintings, statues, engravings, triumphal arches, poems, eulogies, orations and histories. But he believed also that all literary and artistic activity decorated the reign of a sovereign. More than a century before, Aretino had written to the Grand Duke of Florence that the volumes produced under the patronage of princes are "to the aspect of their serene names like torches gleaming in that perpetual splendour which renders testimony to the merits which fortune cannot leave behind, nor time bury in oblivion." In the same strain Colbert wrote a few years after the King began to govern: "Your Majesty knows that aside from the brilliant actions of war, nothing marks more clearly the grandeur and intelligence of princes than buildings. . . . If peace lasts a long while still, we can erect public buildings which will carry the glory and greatness of Your Majesty farther than those the Romans built."

He wanted the King to be the sole Macænas of the realm and to organize and regulate the output of the literary genius of France, just as he was trying to reorganize and regulate the commerce, the industry and the transportation of France "to the greater glory" of Louis XIV. The French Academy was lodged in the Louvre with the King as *protecteur* and Colbert as vice-protector. The state paid for its pens and paper, and Racine said in an address that the Academy considered all the words

of the French language and every syllable of them precious "because we regard them as so many instruments to be used for the glory of our august Protector."

The Academy of Sciences, composed of twenty-one members, also had for protector the King, who gave pensions for some of its members, and money for books and the upkeep of its laboratory. It met twice a week, once for mathematics and once for physics, kept in correspondence with the scholars of France and the world, and Colbert asked from it much technical advice on practical problems of his undertakings.

The Academy of Painting and Sculpture was also lodged in the Louvre, and Le Brun "first painter of the King" became its director for life. Colbert also founded the Academy of Architecture, whose ten members were named by the King. It was given the tasks of defining the principles of architecture and of forming a school of young architects where they could be instructed in the "most correct rules of the art."

It had long been the custom that all artists who were able should cross the Alps to study Italian art and the remains of antiquity. The King founded the Academy of Rome, with twelve fellows, six painters, four sculptors and two architects. They were to rise in summer at five, in winter at six, to hear mass and then to spend the rest of the day in working under the orders of the director, who was to provide for their instruction in arithmetic, perspective and anatomy. During their common meals they were to listen to the reading of history. After a few years of independent existence, the Academy of Rome was attached to the Academy of Painting and Sculpture.

The Gobelins, which had become the manufactory of the decorations and furniture of the King's palaces, had attached to it a school of sixty apprentices who, after ten years of study, were distributed among the different cor-

porations of arts, where, after four years more of practice, they became master workmen. These artisans in artistic handicrafts were spread through the work shops of Paris and France.

In all this activity in the fine arts the King took a strong interest, for looking at beautiful things gave him great pleasure. But he had other pleasures. He hunted every afternoon, rain or shine, and his kennels, together with those of the princes, contained more than a thousand dogs. He was very fond of music. He played several instruments and often sang in chorus. Life at court was a rather rapid succession of balls, feasts, concerts and comedies, but the standard employment of the thousands of idle courtiers, which filled up the intervals of these and other distractions, was gambling. Louis played, but he does not seem to have had a gambler's passion for the game.

The costliest of the King's pleasures were building and women.

Many of the kings of France loved building but none built as much as Louis XIV. He brought the most noted living architect from Rome, who made grandiose plans for the extension of the Louvre; or rather for replacing it with an Italian palace. The plan of a French architect was finally adopted, large sums were spent on it for some dozen years, and then it was left unfinished, because the King had altogether abandoned the Louvre and lived in his huge palace at Versailles, twelve miles from Paris.

The King's father had built at the hamlet of Versailles a small and simple château as a hunting box. Immediately after the death of Mazarin, Louis XIV ordered his landscape gardeners and architects, his chief painter and his hydraulic engineer to plan there a great palace with gardens and fountains. Twenty years later the King established his permanent residence in the new palace. For six years longer, work continued on the wings until the

vast pile was finished and filled with the rich decoration he loved, and all of it was animated by the praise of the glory and power, the goodness and the taste of Louis the King.

But Versailles did not satisfy him. Nearby he built the Trianon of marble, of jasper and porphyry, surrounded by beautiful gardens, a little farther off Clagny, a château for Madame de Montespan, and a little farther off Marly around which "he turned lakes into forests and forests into lakes." For, although he loved flowers and trees, he was never satisfied with nature as it was. He wished it artificial and elaborate. Above all he loved to have the landscape his landscape. That courtly abbé knew the taste of the King, who ended his sonnet on Versailles: "This masterpiece of your hand seems to bring you near to Him who created the heavens, the earth and the waters out of nothing. Because, out of the site the most ill-fitted in the universe, you are making today the wonder of the world."

The cost in money gave the King no pause, nor did he seem to care for the cost in life. For, as the slaves who built the pyramids perished by thousands under the pharaohs, so the workmen who brought the earth for the terraces and dug the great canal and the lake at Versailles, died. At one time there was a "plague so terrible that carts full of dead were secretly driven away every night."

Up to the death of the Queen, which occurred about twenty years after he took the reins of power into his hands, the life of Louis XIV was exceedingly licentious. He never cared for his stupid and ugly little Spanish wife and had a succession of three openly acknowledged mistresses besides a number of passing "*bonnes fortunes.*" Louise de la Vallière, one of the court ladies, was a girl of seventeen, slightly lame, with a pink and white complexion and blue eyes. She loved the King very sincerely. He made her a duchess and was faithful to her for six

years, when he became fascinated with one of the Queen's ladies in waiting, daughter of a duke, wife of a marquis, whose active wit and somewhat aggressive charms were a piquant contrast to the gentle and frail Louise. Nevertheless he did not forget Louise and when, after watching her successful rival for five years, she withdrew into a convent, the King wept and sent Colbert to bring her back. At seeing her Louis wept again and the Marquise de Montespan embraced her, weeping also. So the Duchess, the Marquise and the King lived a sort of family life together for two years, when Louise withdrew finally to the convent, where she died. The King's relations with Madame de Montespan lasted ten or twelve years. But as her beauty faded and her wit grew acid, the King was suddenly captured by Mlle. de Fontanges, "a beautiful idiot," who became a duchess, bore the King a son and died in a convent within two years.

The mixed family relations among his six legitimate and eleven legitimated children does not seem to have affected the self assurance of the King. He was not indeed a victim of that entire insensibility to the real meaning of religion which led his equally dissolute contemporary Charles II of England to the opinion that God was too good a fellow to be hard on a man for taking a little pleasure on his way through this world. But it seems as if Louis XIV unconsciously assumed that ordinary moral laws were not to be too strictly applied to a person so important to God and man as he was.

When he was forty-five years old his queen died and a year afterward he was secretly married by the Archbishop of Paris to Madame de Maintenon, three years his senior. He remained faithful to her for thirty-two years and undoubtedly had for her a real affection. She was the granddaughter of Agrippa d'Aubigné, historian, poet, Huguenot captain and youthful friend of Henry of Navarre. Put to school in a convent of Ursuline nuns, she

was converted to Catholicism. She married the comic poet Scarron, and at his death had friends at court among whom was Madame de Montespan. The King met her in his mistress's apartments and appointed her governess of his children. Seven years later she completely replaced all the King's favourites.

She was never crowned Queen but every one knew that she was the King's wife. She dressed well but comparatively simply. She kept her friendly manners, but her room was the centre of the court where, seated in an armchair even in the presence of the King, she received every body, princesses, generals, bishops or ambassadors. For twenty-five years she knew more of affairs of state than any Queen of France before or since. For the King often worked in her room for hours discussing affairs with one of his ministers, while she sat at the opposite corner of the fireplace with a book or her embroidery: and it was rare that her opinion was not asked during these discussions. Madame de Maintenon was the only woman who had any political influence over Louis XIV and she did not have very much. But she did bring about some appointments of ministers, generals or bishops and few of them turned out very well. As for really determining the general line of the King's policy in diplomacy and war, there was no one in his life after he began to rule who could do that.

CHAPTER XXXVII

THE WARS OF LOUIS XIV

The object of the foreign policy of Louis XIV was to make his will dominant in Europe. During a diplomatic dispute, not long before his first declaration of war, he wrote: "These people do not fully understand me or my power, because when I ask anything, it seems to me that means I wish it and I will have it." He began his first war by deliberate choice. Richelieu and Mazarin had left France so strong that no one would have attacked her. The young King was aware of this, for he wrote of the situation when he took the reins of power: "There was no movement in the kingdom which could oppose my plans and peace was apparently established with my neighbours for as long as I myself wished it." He did not wish peace and spent two years getting ready for war, among other things casting 1600 cannons in France, and buying 800 more from Danish foundries.

When he was ready, in the spring of 1667, he attacked the Spanish Netherlands; a large part of which he claimed in the name of his Spanish wife by virtue of the right of *devolution*. This was a legal trick, applying to political inheritance a local custom of private inheritance which prevailed in Brabant. The Dutch knew that the French invasion of the Spanish Netherlands meant only the wish of the French King to extend his boundary toward the north. The strong French army easily took half a dozen fortified cities, and then the triumphant young King found himself checked by the Dutch Republic, which formed, with Sweden and England, the Triple Alliance to bring about peace. Louis XIV was furious

but deemed it prudent to accept in May 1668 the peace of Aix la Chapelle. By this agreement Spain surrendered to him twelve cities on the northern border of France which, well fortified, would effectually bar against invaders the too short road to Paris.

This action of Holland in forcing peace by the Triple Alliance, aided by the misplaced jocosity of some Dutch gazetteers, left a permanent resentment in the mind of Louis XIV. He felt this was really commendable because it was directed against republicans and Calvinists, plainly opposed both in politics and religion to the will of God for man. Besides Holland barred that extension of the boundary of France to the North Sea which had been the day dream of some previous kings and statesmen. Therefore, Louis XIV believed he was only discussing doing God's will on earth when he talked of "annihilating" the Dutch Republic.

Immediately after the peace he began diplomatic action to isolate Holland. Charles II of England bound himself, by the secret treaty of Dover, to partition Holland and to use French soldiers to change the religion of England. This treaty was concealed from the nation, his parliament, and most of his councillors, by two false treaties; as shameful a trick as any ruler ever used to deceive his people. Part of the price Louis paid for this was a huge subsidy. After he had bought the King of Sweden and the German princes, he frightened the Emperor into a treaty of neutrality. In the spring of 1672 he had the Dutch completely isolated and he suddenly poured over the borders the largest army Europe had seen since the crusades. At first he swept all before him, but a revolution brought the able diplomat and resolute soldier, William of Orange, to the headship of the Dutch Republic and the opening of the dykes checked the French advance by the waters of the ocean.

All war of the times was pitiless. But when the French burnt two great villages with all the inhabitants ("not one of whom was allowed to leave their burning houses"),[1] Holland appealed by illustrated pamphlets to the pity and wrath if the world.* A hatred of the French before unknown began to spread over Europe; even as the hatred and fear of Spain had spread in the latter half of the sixteenth century. Catholic sovereigns, like the King of Spain, and the Emperor, undertook the defense of Calvinist Holland; the allies of France fell away from her; Marshal Turenne, the ablest general in Europe, was killed in action, and, six years after he began "the annihilation" of the Dutch Republic Louis XIV made peace at Nimeguen (1678). France remained the dominant power of Europe, but the Dutch Republic was not destroyed and Spain paid the costs by abandoning to France, territory and some dozen fortified towns, on the northern border.

Louis XIV, keeping on foot a great army, continued the extension of his boundaries by the so-called processes of reunion. Courts appointed by him began to hear suits for the inclusion in his realm of all the territories which had at any time been attached to the lordships ceded by the peace of Westphalia in 1648. These processes, in which he was practically judge, jury and sheriff in trials affecting his own claims, were regarded by other nations as amounting to conquests in peace by a legal fiction. Three years after the peace of Nimeguen, he crowned by the seizure of Strassburg, these acts of thinly disguised violence. The result was an alliance of Holland, Sweden, Spain and some princes of the Empire against France.

War was postponed by the march of the Turks on Vienna with a huge army, and when the Germans rallying under the lead of Poland, had driven the Turk down

[1]Letter of the French Minister of War.

the Danube, Europe was not ready to fight. Louis XIV obtained the Truce of Ratisbon by which France was to keep for twenty years most of the territory she had occupied by the *réunions*. Again Europe had given way to his imperious will and his "glory" was at its height. A period of thirty years of slow decline in popularity at home and prestige abroad then began.

He was not satisfied with the position of dominance he had gained; defended by the best army in the world and by a hundred new fortresses, erected to protect his frontiers by Vauban; the greatest genius in fortification the art of war had yet seen. He continued to show an attitude which kept alive the suspicions of his neighbours that his career of conquest was not over. An ambassador returned from Versailles told the Venetian Senate that "the powers of Europe justly feared that France was seeking the universal monarchy of the world." Deeds of haughty violence on the King's part, from time to time, strengthened this fear. The aristocratic Republic of Genoa, in defiance of his orders, continued to build galleys. He sent a fleet to demand the surrender of the galleys. When the senate hesitated about complying, the French cannon destroyed three quarters of the city. French and Savoyard troops attacked the Vaudois (simple heretics living in a small district of the Alps) and made their valleys a solitude. This coming on top of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes increased the fears of all Protestants throughout the world.

The consequence of all these facts and feelings was the formation in July, 1686, of the League of Augsburg which united Calvinist, Lutheran and Catholic states. It included many of the German states, the Emperor, Spain, Sweden and Holland in a defensive alliance to preserve existing treaties. Two years later, when the Emperor was fighting the Turks and William of Orange was leading Dutch and Swedish troops to support the parlia-

mentary revolution in England, Louis XIV broke the truce of Ratisbon by invading the Empire. He protested that his intentions were pacific; he only wished to defend himself. In two months he was master of the left bank of the Rhine, except Coblenz.

The war which ensued (1688–1697) soon developed into a conflict of France against all her neighbours except Switzerland. She had, however, the two advantages of the interior lines of communication and single command and managed for a long time to hold her own. But finally Louis XIV was forced to accept (1697) the peace of Ryswick. He surrendered all his conquests and many of his *réunions*. He returned Hudson Bay and Newfoundland to England and with them the control of the fur trade and the cod fisheries. He also definitely lost the mastery of the sea. He was compelled to acknowledge the success of the English revolution which had established the liberties of a constitutional monarchy, which he detested.

Above all, he had lost in the "imponderables": especially by his terrible devastation of the Palatinate in the Rhineland. The brilliant Marshal Villars, who saved France from utter ruin by his victories, describes it in his memoirs: "During that time Marshal Duras finished a work which can be called a blot on the glory of the French nation.... The King had been persuaded that the safety of the state demanded the putting of a desert between our frontier and the armies of our enemies. In order to do that, the great cities of Trier, Spires, Worms, Heidelberg and a large number of smaller places were burnt. That pernicious idea was pushed so far that the sowing of crops was entirely forbidden within ten miles of either bank of the river Meuse. No one has ever been able to imagine by what fatality such horrible advice could have been given. But the orders were given, followed and executed with a severity which will always be a reproach to

the bravest nation in the universe." The author of a widely circulated pamphlet wrote of it: "The French of other days were looked on as a nation, polite, humane, peaceful with a spirit opposed to barbarities, but, today, in the opinion of the neighbours of France, a Frenchman and a cannibal seem pretty much the same." The devastation of the Palatinate is the sort of deed which creates in the minds of men, one of those cherished hatreds which are handed down from father to son like heirlooms.

Five years after the treaty of Ryswick, began the longest and the most terrible of the wars of Louis XIV; the war of the Spanish succession.

There were, at the end of the seventeenth century, six princes who put forward claims to inherit the crown of the childless and moribund Charles II of Spain. By the ordinary rules of hereditary succession Louis XIV and his sons had the best claim, but his mother and his wife had renounced their rights to succeed to the throne of Spain. The lawyers of Louis XIV claimed, however, that rights to inherit or transmit royalty were divine and could not be renounced by human treaties. As a union of the crowns of France and Spain would plainly have provoked another general European war, Louis XIV began negotiations with England, who was unwilling to see either the House of Austria or the House of Bourbon inherit the entire vast empire of the Spanish Habsburgs. Two partition treaties were signed in succession, one dividing the inheritance into three, the second into two, parts. Scarcely was the second signed, when the King of Spain died, leaving his entire dominions by will to the grandson of Louis XIV. The Spaniards, affronted by the idea of the dismemberment of the great empire of Spain by a treaty made between foreigners, hailed this settlement with joy. Louis XIV hesitated for several days whether or not to stand by the Treaty of Partition, and then presented his grandson to the court assembled in

the grand apartment of Versailles with the simple remark: "Gentlemen, there is the King of Spain."

The prospect of the possible future union in the hands of one sovereign of the control of France, Spain, the Netherlands, South Italy and Milan was terrifying. Still more menacing, especially to England and Holland whose people lived by the sea, was the prospect of the addition of the huge South American Colonial Empire of Spain to the huge French Colonial Empire of the watershed of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi. These fears made war imminent: the brusque and provocative conduct of Louis XIV made it certain.

The Grand Alliance was formed and finally backed by all Europe. War raged for eleven years and France barely held her own. England found in Marlborough the greatest leader of fighting men in her history. At Blenheim, France lost thirty thousand out of an army of fifty thousand men; at Oudenarde the French army was cut to pieces. After seven years of war France seemed almost exhausted. But in the darkest hours, Louis XIV showed the courage of a king. At Malplaquet the army finally withdrew from its position in good order with all its guns, after a loss of ten thousand men, but twenty-three thousand of the allies had fallen before their trenches.

Five treaties were signed in 1713 at Utrecht between France, England, Holland, Portugal, the Duke of Savoy and the King of Prussia. Philip V remained King of Spain but the crowns of France and Spain could never be united. The Austrian Habsburgs received out of the Spanish inheritance the southern Netherlands, Milan, Sardinia and Naples. The result of the war may therefore be called a compromise. A French Bourbon was King of Spain, but the great Spanish empire was divided and the menacing power of the House of Habsburg was gone. The idea of the balance of power which has so

frequently led to the anomaly of present war to prevent a possible future war, was firmly established in the minds of European statesmen. Even Louis XIV was obliged to take its irresistible influence for granted.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

THE STATECRAFT OF LOUIS XIV. THE WARNING OF FÉNELON—LA BRUYÈRE—LA FONTAINE

The home policy of Louis XIV had two objects. The first was to secure an unlimited obedience to the king as the sole source of authority in the state, the second was to keep his own person thrown into proper relief as the divinely appointed incarnation of France.

The returned Venetian ambassador reported to the senate the outcome of these two governing ideas of the home policy of Louis XIV: "The unlimited authority of the King, the sensitive jealousy with which he uses it and the haughtiness of the ministry does not allow anything except words of praise and obsequiousness to pass the lips of the princes and nobles. . . . The nobles, though they clearly recognize that they are kept down with assiduous servility around the sovereign and with base submission to the ministry, . . . nevertheless, beg as favours those posts of advancement which they believe ought to come to them by right of birth. The clergy defer blindly to the wishes of the court, although surely in many instances they can hardly be free from internal remorse for doing so. . . . The King is never weary of listening to his own praises and his ambition is limitless. . . . He is jealous of applause for superiority, not only in regard to those gifts of heart and mind which are really the fine flower of true mastery over men, but also in things of very small importance."

In the first twenty-five years of his active rule, Louis XIV represented France and embodied the wishes of the great mass of influential Frenchmen. Patriotism became

loyalty and loyalty became religion, for the King was given of God. This politico-religious passion survived in some parts of the population, all the strains put upon it by pride, ignorance and folly during more than four generations, as for instance in that epitaph of a tiny remote church which records near the altar the names of a dozen inhabitants killed in 1793 by Republican bands, "fallen for Christ and their legitimate King."

It was only in the last thirty years of the reign of Louis XIV that the evil effects of his pride began to be apparent in the poverty of his own people and the hostility of the other peoples of Europe. Then gradually Louis XIV, in spite of all the glories of his reign in war, in diplomacy, in art and letters, began to cease to seem the incarnation of France. There spread slowly the suspicion that the King was the cause of the misery of his people and this brought it to pass, that when the body of Louis the Great was borne to its tomb at St. Denis it was greeted with curses by some of those it passed.

Of this change of sentiment and the reasons for it the King received warnings, few but faithful. Marshal Vauban, who earned alike by his genius, his industry and his character the chief place among modern military engineers, wrote not long before the last and most terrible of the wars of Louis XIV: "Nearly a tenth part of the people is reduced to beggary. Of the nine other parts five have nothing to give the beggars for they are nearly as badly off themselves. Three parts have great difficulty in living—the other part consists of 100,000 families among whom there are not 10,000 really prosperous."

The most outspoken remonstrance was from one of the great writers of the century, François Fénelon. He was the son of a family of the country gentry who led a life of genteel poverty in a crumbling old château with faded tapestries and a single pair of carriage horses; of which one was blind in an eye and the other splayed in a shoul-

der. François followed his elder brother into the priesthood and while still young, wrote treatises on Pulpit Eloquence and On the Existence of God. His Essay on the Education of Girls remained influential until well into the next century. His *Télemachus,* called a "pedagogical romance," has been again and again reprinted and retranslated. It is filled with covert critical allusions to the condition of society and the government. He was appointed tutor to the favourite grandson of Louis XIV, and made Archbishop of Cambrai. But his book *Maxims of the Saints* became suspected of heresy, so the King confined him during the last eighteen years of his life to his province, where he performed with the utmost faithfulness the duties of his office.

It has been suggested that his finest literary work is to be found in his correspondence. A specimen may be seen in the following extracts from a letter to the King: "For some thirty years your principal ministers have raised you to the heavens for having paled the grandeur of all your predecessors put together; which means for having impoverished all France in order to bring into your court a monstrous and incurable luxury. . . . They have made your name odious and the entire French nation unbearable to all your neighbours. . . . They have caused, during twenty years, bloody wars . . . and the treaties of peace have been signed to avoid a worse fate as a man gives up his purse when a highwayman says 'your money or your life.' . . . The frightful troubles which have desolated all Europe for more than twenty years, the floods of blood, the many provinces sacked, the long list of villages and cities burnt to ashes, are the accursed results of that war of 1672 begun for your glory. . . . Even your people, who have so loved you, are beginning to lose their confidence in you. . . . 'If the King' they say 'had a father's heart for his people would he not find his glory in giving them bread, rather

than in keeping fortresses on the frontier which cause war?' Sire, what answer is there to that question?"

These contemporary judgments have been echoed in modern times. Mr. Hassall, writing from the point of view of an English Tory, says: "Modern historical writers, for the greater part hailing from France, are well nigh unanimous in wholesale condemnation of the age of Louis XIV." This attitude he stigmatizes as "peculiarly ungracious, ungrateful and unhistorical for French writers," and suggests that it is taken because "they allow themselves to be carried away by feeble republican predilections."

But, aside from all bias from political prejudice—to which monarchists are certainly no more immune than republicans—judgment on the reign of Louis XIV will depend largely on what the judges believe to be best for France and the world. Those who believe that the best use that could be made of the inexhaustible energy of the French is now, or ever has been, the attempt to force their rule on unwilling populations—those who believe that the path towards the glory of France leads continuously across the field of battle—will look on Louis XIV as a very great king. But those who do not agree with Mr. Hassall "that the instinct which told him Belgium ought to be in French hands" was "unerring," or that "his attempts to make the Mediterranean a French lake showed consummate statesmanship," will refuse to rank Louis XIV among the greatest of kings. Unlimited admiration of him by strong adherents of monarchy is strange, for he seems to have done more than any other man to make the destruction of the monarchy by the revolution inevitable.

While the foreign policy of Louis XIV finally brought him a certain amount of disaster, his home policy attained on the whole its immediate objects. Through the bureaucracy the King was absolute master of France. In one

thing only his reign at home was a complete failure but that was the one most necessary thing—the reform of the finances. The King according to Colbert was really bankrupt at the beginning of his reign and again and again he warned his master of danger. In 1670 he urged a reduction of expenses and wrote "Your Majesty thinks ten times more of war than of his finances." Ten years later he warned the King of the imminent danger of an "almost universal bankruptcy" and shortly before his death he gave notice of a huge deficit.

When the great minister was gone, the situation grew worse and, not long before the King's death, the treasurer advised open bankruptcy, because, in spite of a reduction of the bonds of the state to one half their value, the revenues of three years were spent in advance. Louis XIV never sincerely heeded any of these warnings. On his death bed he said to his heir, a child of five years: "I have loved war too much, do not imitate me in that, nor in the too great expense with which I have lived." But not long before this scene he was planning extravagant changes at Marly and getting ready for war with England in support of the Pretender. He made no effort whatever to relieve the condition of the state. As for the fundamental vices of French finance, like the sale of offices and the farming of taxes, neither he nor his ministers dreamed of undertaking the long and patient self denial of an attempt to cure them. Even the great Colbert was unable to do anything but accept these inveterate evils and live from hand to mouth.

As is always the case, the burden of excessive taxation and the disasters resulting from unwise and dishonest finance were passed on, until they fell with crushing force on the shoulders of the poorest. The great majority of the population of France, roughly estimated at 19,000,000 in 1700, were farmers, and the majority of them cultivated small farms. They, as well as the poorer

classes in the small towns, could ill bear heavy taxation. There were revolts nearly every year of the reign of Louis XIV. These were put down by troops, the leaders hanged, and hundreds of their followers condemned to row in the galleys.

These revolts were the outcome of misery. La Bruyère, tutor and afterwards gentleman in waiting to the Duke of Bourbon, has left in his *Characters or Manners and Morals of This Century,* a sort of sketch book of French society, which contains under various headings a large number of condensed observations, moral, social and political. As for example: "In all ages men, for the sake of a piece of land more or less, have agreed in plundering each other, burning each other's houses and killing each other. In order to do this more ingeniously and with greater certainty, they have invented beautiful rules which are called the military art: they have attached to the practise of these rules glory or the most solid reputation; and they have, from century to century, improved upon the manner of reciprocally destroying one another. . . . If, content with their own, men could have let alone what belonged to their neighbours, the world would always have had peace and liberty." This observation is illustrated by a rapid sketch of those who love to read in the gazettes of fire and blood.

Many of his observations are thus illustrated by portraits, usually done in the manner of an etcher with a few rapid strokes. They are realistic and individual, though alike in being all tinged by his cynical view of human nature. But he is far more artist than philosopher and so able to seize the salient points and give to his tiny portraits a striking lifelikeness. Imaginary portraits have been written by many authors, the most notable in English are, perhaps, those of Steele and Addison, but the name of La Bruyère stands at the head of the list.

Although he did not know the soul of the French peas-

ant of his time, with whom he had never been in contact, he has left us a picture of him as striking as "The Man with the Hoe." "One sees spread through the fields certain wild animals, male and female, black, livid, burnt by the sun, attached to the ground which they till and work with an invincible obstinacy: they have something like an articulate voice and when they get up on their feet, they show a human face and indeed they are men. They retire at night into dens, where they live on black bread, water and roots; they save other men the trouble of sowing, of tilling and harvesting in order to live, and so they deserve not to lack a share of the bread they have sown." The man who could see that picture and describe it to his fellows was an unconscious prophet of the violent revolution which came a century later.

There was, indeed, an underground current running through the intellectual life of France which Louis XIV could not reach, and still less canalize, in spite of all his efforts to constrain by a general academic method—(an artistic orthodoxy)—the amazing output of the art and literature of the seventeenth century. This underground current appears in subtle form in the work of Jean de la Fontaine whose father was "master of waters and woods and captain of hunting" at Château Thierry. Jean inherited his father's sinecure and became a member of the large class of state officials. Up to the age of about forty he lived in the country and his verse shows a vivid feeling for nature. He passed from the house of one wealthy patron to another and, while the first half of his seventy-four years was spent in the country, the other half was passed in high society at Paris, where he came to know the great literary personalities of his day.

He was, however, in his heart, a rebel against the discipline which Louis XIV was imposing not only on politics but on all the arts. An amusing conversation with Racine on the absolute authority of kings has survived.

Racine quoted the authority given by God to Saul. "If kings," answered La Fontaine, "are masters of our property and our lives and of everything, they must have the right to look on us as mere ants compared to them and I will agree that you are right if you can show me that is true by the Scriptures." Racine, imperturbably inventing a verse, quoted "walk before your king like ants" and La Fontaine was satisfied. For he had, not only the negligence of the ordinary things in life, but also that extreme simplicity, which often goes with the poetic temperament.

The important work of La Fontaine is of two sorts, his *Tales* and his *Fables*. Both are alike in their easy mastery of the poetic art, but they are extremely different in their content. A distinguished modern French critic has called the *Tales* of La Fontaine "a bad book which ought to be kept in any library under lock and key." This means that there is in some of the tales the same element that is in our own greatest story teller Chaucer at the end of the fourteenth century and, in its crassest form, in the works of La Fontaine's English contemporaries the dramatists of the reign of Charles II. La Fontaine's life was not dissonant with some of his tales, but, at the age of seventy-one, he was converted by a Jansenist abbé. As a proof of his penitence he renounced before a delegation of the French Academy his volume of "infamous tales," confessing that it was "an abominable book."

The *Fables* of La Fontaine need neither condemnation nor defense. It has become the reading book of all, young and old, who, within or without France, wish to learn the charm of the French language.

The *Fables* are full of that "underground current" of thought and feeling which Louis XIV was never able to reach, still less to guide. In spite of the fact that La Fontaine lost no opportunity to praise Versailles and its mas-

ter, the King never liked him and never granted him a pension. A specimen of the reasons why is shown in the following fable. The translation loses entirely the literary charm of the original but it does suggest its subtle social and political satire.

THE ANIMALS ILL OF THE PLAGUE

The sorest ill that Heaven hath
Sent on this lower world in wrath,—
The plague (to call it by its name,)
One single day of which
Would Plato's ferryman enrich,—
Waged war on beasts both wild and tame,
All did not die, but all fell ill;
No hunting more by force or skill;
The fox no longer lurked to slay
His innocent and tender prey.
Even when by chance they got some meat
To save their lives they could not eat,
The very turtle doves had fled;
So love, and therefore joy, were dead.
The Lion council held and said:
"My friends I truly do believe
This awful scourge for which we grieve,
Is for our sins a punishment
By righteous heaven upon us sent.
Let us our guiltiest resign
A sacrifice to wrath divine.
Perhaps this offering, although small,
May save the life and health of all.
By history we find it noted
That lives have been this way devoted.
Then let us turn our eyes within
To ferret out the hidden sin.
Let no one spare himself nor flatter,
But clear his conscience in the matter.
I will begin. I've played the glutton
Extremely often upon mutton.
What harm had all my victims done?
There's no true answer except none.
Perhaps, sometimes, by hunger prest
I ate the shepherd with the rest.
I yield myself, if need there be;
And yet I think, in equity,

All should confess their sins with me;
For laws of right and justice cry,
The guiltiest alone should die.
Sire, said the Fox, Your Majesty
Is humbler than a king need be,
And over squeamish in this case.
What! Eating stupid sheep a crime?
No, never, Sire, at any time.
It rather was an act of grace,
An honour to the ovine race
And as for shepherds, Sire, I swear,
The fate Your Majesty describes,
Was punishment not full but fair
For such usurpers o'er our tribes.

Thus Reynard glibly spoke
And loud applause from flatterers broke.
Of neither tiger, boar nor bear
Did any keen inquirer dare
To ask for crimes of high degree;
Those who could bite or scratch were all
From any mortal sin quite free;
The very dogs, both great and small,
Were saints, as far as dogs could be.

The Ass when he was reached in turn,
Spoke thus in terms of deep concern:—
I happened through a field to pass;
The monks, its owners, were at mass;
Keen hunger, leisure, tender grass,
And add to these the devil too,
All tempted me the deed to do.
I browsed the bigness of my tongue,
Since truth must out, I own it wrong.
On this a hue and cry arose,
As if the beasts were all his foes:
The Wolf, haranguing lawyer wise,
Denounced the Ass for sacrifice—
The baldpate, scabby, ragged lout,
By whom the plague had come, no doubt.
His fault was judged the rope's affair.
What eat another's grass! Oh shame!
The running noose with feet on air
For that offense were all too tame!
And soon poor Grizzle felt the same.

So all men's courts acquit the strong
While weakness dooms the weak as wrong.

La Fontaine seems entirely unfitted both by temperament and experience to become a reformer, pointing out the evils of his own day and announcing hope for the future. But his light and charming satire has profound roots in the wish, so deep as to be unconscious, to find a base for human society in justice, brotherhood and charity—to regulate human relations, not by rules of law or inherited customs, but by the spirit of humanity. This social and political evangel, this intellectual revolt against what was "said by them of old time," this new political good news—was to become one of the main causes of the revolution.

CHAPTER XXXIX

THE RELIGIOUS POLICY OF LOUIS XIV. JANSENISTS. CALVINISTS. PASCAL

These intermittent revolts against taxation and the bread riots at Paris with volleys in the street from the royal guards, never became a serious menace to the King's idea that he ought to be able to tax as much as he deemed necessary. They were too localized and too lacking in leaders to pass from mobs into revolution. But in the realm of religion the King met with serious and prolonged resistance to his will: the Jansenists and the Calvinists he could not entirely master.

The history of Jansenism extends over nearly a century and a half and is too complicated to be followed here. For its beginning one must go back to the closing years of the power of Richelieu and three folio volumes on theology published after the death of their author, Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres, and professor of exegesis at the University of Louvain. The book, entitled *Augustinus*, was an exposition of the views of St. Augustine and St. Paul on grace and free will. The peculiar doctrines of the *Augustinus* had much affinity with those of Calvin, who, in his *Institutes*, published a century before, had also leaned heavily on St. Augustine and St. Paul. Jansenism was, however, from the beginning to the end of its active history, a strong opponent of Calvinism, with whose doctors Jansen carried on active controversy. He also began that controversy with the Jesuits which his followers long continued.

The centre of Jansenism was the ancient convent of Port Royal and a settlement of men seeking communion with God in a sort of permanent *retreat*, which grew up

around it. The object of Jansenism was interpreted to the French general public the year of the accession of Louis XIV in a widely read devotional book on *Frequent Communion*, which was an exhortation against worldliness in religion.

The Jesuit attack on the teaching of the Jansenists was so far successful in rousing suspicions of heresy that finally eighty-five bishops asked the Pope to give judgment on five propositions in regard to divine grace and its relation to salvation, which, they alleged, were to be found in the *Augustinus*. The Pope condemned them and, when the Jansenists replied that they were not in Jansen's work, an assembly of the French clergy announced that the Pope condemned the five points "as contained in Jansen and in the sense of Jansen."

At this stage in the discussion the Jansenists found their greatest advocate. Blaise Pascal was the son of a provincial judge. He had already begun those researches and discoveries in pure mathematics and physics, which rank him among the greatest and most original of the world's scholars. At the age of thirty-one, after long unrest and questioning of soul, he had, on the night of the 23rd of November, 1654, the mystic experience of conversion. God revealed Himself to him and he gave himself to God. For the remaining eight years of his life he always carried about with him the parchment on which he had written his prayer of surrender to the divine grace.

Even before this he had been a friend and frequenter of the community around Port Royal. At their request he took up their defense in a series of eighteen letters, printed anonymously at intervals during about a year, entitled "Letters of Louis de Montalte to a friend in the provinces and to the Reverend Fathers of the Jesuits upon the morals and the politics of those Fathers." This attack upon the Jesuits produced an extraordinary

sensation. Logically the letters were not unanswerable, but the Jesuits found no apologist who could hold his own against the most skilful polemic writer France has ever produced among her thousands of debaters. The subtle wit, the simplicity mingled with eloquence, the dramatic power, the delicate irony, the effort to find a logical base in the eternal principles of reason and morality, have given to this series of letters, written for a very local occasion, and discussing technical points of theology and casuistry, the immortality of a great work of art.

After Pascal's death at the age of forty, there were found a mass of pieces of paper of various shapes and sizes containing scattered paragraphs of his writing. They were the elements of his projected *Apology for the Christian Religion* and they were printed under the title of *Thoughts*. The *Imitation of Christ* is the record of religious experiences left for future generations by a devoted mediæval mystic. The *Thoughts* suggests how a great modern man, a path breaker for those who were to follow him in mathematics and physics, would, if time had been granted him to finish his work, have adjusted the relations between his reason and the mystic experiences of his faith.

The Jansenists won toleration at first in the field of morals and religion, but they became involved in politics. Cardinal de Retz, Archbishop of Paris, was arrested by Mazarin and the writers of the colony of Port Royal issued pamphlets urging his return to his province. They also received many nobles who had been concerned in the Fronde. This was the reason why the King had the "Provincial Letters" examined by a commission of bishops and theologians, who condemned it to be publicly burnt by the executioner. Port Royal was forbidden to receive novices and the colony dispersed. Mazarin on his death bed advised Louis XIV never to tolerate the sect of the Jansenists.

Trouble continued during the reign of Louis XIV and, in fifteen years, some forty or fifty persons spent longer or shorter periods in the Bastille for Jansenism. Just before his death (1713) the King procured from the Pope the Bull "Unigenitus," which condemned "the heresies contained in the famous five propositions of Jansen," as well as a hundred and one propositions taken from other Jansenist writers. But this Papal action aroused the ancient Gallican spirit, to which it seemed an infringement of the liberties of the Gallican Church. Several theological faculties and the Parlement of Paris had to be forced to register the bull. A group of bishops, with the Archbishop of Paris at their head, even refused to allow its circulation in their dioceses. So Jansenism threatened to become an ecclesiastical and a political question to trouble the King's successor.

The King's determination to suppress Protestantism was not, like his attack on Jansenism, inherited from Mazarin. It was the result of an increasing interest in religious affairs, which began with the death of the Queen and his marriage to that zealous churchwoman, Madame de Maintenon. His interest was maintained by men of a younger generation who became more prominent in the royal service after the death of Colbert. They were active Catholics and interested in theological questions. This general atmosphere around him and the growing belief that he was high priest as well as King, finally led Louis XIV to the determination of annihilating Calvinism in France.

Years before he came to this determination, the assemblies of the clergy had urged him to use his "authority for the entire extirpation of heresy." By their influence the meetings of the synod of the Calvinist Church were not authorized after 1661, and by various legal quibbles many temples for their worship were demolished. The spirit of the Edict of Nantes was violated long before its let-

ter was broken. The Huguenots could neither bring their children into the world, nor die, as they wished. No Huguenot woman could be a midwife and Huguenots who were very ill had to receive a visit from the local judges to see if they did not wish to become Catholics.

In Languedoc there were some feeble efforts at resistance to such restrictions, and the governor, when he took thirteen prisoners, made one of them hang the other twelve; but there was really no serious resistance. The repression continued. Those articles of the Edict of Nantes which put Huguenots on a par with Catholics in state service were violated and the Huguenots were progressively shut out from all state employments. When, in consequence of this, they flocked to the learned professions, they were forbidden to become lawyers or doctors. The mixed courts, half Protestant and half Catholic, were abolished and the parish priests were exhorted by letters from Paris to examine the conduct of "the pretended reformed" and if any evil was found in them to denounce the culpable to the local judges. In at least one instance we know, from a letter of the First President of the Parlement of Bordeaux, that an ex-Huguenot minister, who had a wife and children, was sent to the galleys for life, because, although "the proof of the chief charge against him was very defective, the zeal of the judges went beyond the rules of law to make an example."

The most cruel means employed to suppress the Huguenots was the dragonnades. It was an old custom to quarter troops upon the inhabitants. In 1680 the royal *intendant* of Poitou brought into the district a force of dragoons, which he was ordered to quarter on Huguenots; but to quarter a few on Catholics so as not to make the thing too evident. A royal proclamation was published exempting converts from the quartering of troops during two years. Letters from Paris said the royal intention was not to be announced, but orders were to be

secretly given to carry out the King's wish to force the Huguenots to become converted. The dragoons inflicted terrible torture on Huguenot families; feet were roasted over the coals, men and women were kept awake for days. The terror of these proceedings brought thirty thousand conversions in upper Poitou within a year. The success of this expedient spread it all over France and the majority of the Calvinists were forced to deny their faith by a persecution which reached from the cradle to the grave and fixed the blazing centre of its pains on the hearth around which the children gathered.

It is true that many of the churches of Europe, whether Catholic or Protestant, still thought it the duty of the magistrate to help to save the souls of the people by repressing the public teaching of error. The suppression of Huguenot worship, although a retrogression for France, was not against the still prevalent attitude of the world. But for the perfidious cruelty of their "conversion" there is no excuse. True, there were places and cases where heresy was still punished by death. A young man of twenty was hanged in Scotland in 1697 for blasphemy and denying the doctrine of the Trinity. But, in spite of such scattered deeds of cruelty, many rulers were inclined, long before the end of the seventeenth century, to accept the phrase attributed to Elizabeth, "No windows into men's souls." The preamble of the very Edict which revoked the Edict of Nantes, forbade any one to trouble the Calvinists who gave up public worship, or to make any attempt to force them to do anything further against their conscience.

A century before, after the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the dishonour of a treacherous king was repudiated by France. But the great Bossuet spoke for the articulate part of the nation, when, in one of his orations he called "the conversion of the Huguenots, the miracle of our day." Any one who thoroughly understands the

perverted atmosphere of the sixteenth century is inclined to condone somewhat the cruelties which men of all sorts of theological opinions, in all parts of the European world, were willing, during that century, to inflict on their fellows in the name of Christ. But that France, at the end of the seventeenth century, should have been seduced by a royal rake turned fanatic, into giving herself over without protest to believe a lie in the shape of the heresy of the duty of spreading Christian truth by torturing and killing—a venerable lie which the leaders of the world's intelligence were then beginning to find outworn—seems, to those who love her as a great carrier of beauty, light, and liberty for the world, the most shadowed page in her shining history. It was out of character for France to take the executioner's part in the last great persecution for religion. It is a consolation to know that at least one distinguished Frenchman, Marshal Vauban, had the courage to protest by asking the King to restore the Edict of Nantes.

The persecution of the Huguenots was not only a crime but also a huge blunder. After they had been excluded from public service and the professions, they had taken to commerce and manufactures. The moral discipline of their churches was strict and they were as a whole honest, industrious and economical. These qualities made them prosperous. The Venetian Ambassador wrote that "some people estimated the number of the heretics at 1,600,000, and thought that two-thirds of the commerce of the realm was in their hands." The very best of them refused to bow to the King's will in a matter of conscience. Those who preferred their religion to their liberty, went to the galleys and died at the oars. Those who could escape, and preferred their religion to their fortune, streamed in all directions over the borders. In spite of royal prohibition and heavy penalties for emigrants who were caught they fled by thousands from France. Many added their energies and their sincere religious faith to the American

stock. Many more escaped into the surrounding Protestant countries; strengthening their industries and increasing their fear and hatred of Louis XIV. For Protestants generally now, mistakenly but naturally, attributed to him the intention of uniting Catholic powers for the annihilation of Protestantism throughout the world.

This loss Louis XIV could not even balance by success in his effort to reduce France to one form of worship. Calvinism was not destroyed. The insurrection of the Calvinist population of the Cevennes mountains gave him eight years guerrilla war. In all parts of France ostensibly "converted" Huguenots continued secretly to practise their religion and, eight days before the King's death, a band of pastors and some elders of churches, meeting in a deserted quarry, reconstituted the Synod of the Reformed Church of France; secret and illegal but with more than a million members and adherents.

CHAPTER XL

THE GLORY OF FRENCH LITERATURE. CORNEILLE, RACINE, MOLIÈRE

La Fontaine was one of the greatest of a galaxy of brilliant writers by whom the artistic energy of the French nation gave unfading glory to the reign of a king who prided himself on having made France great. This movement of artistic energy was well under way when Louis XIV began to govern: to suppose that it would have ceased if he had been succeeded on the throne by his son instead of by his great grandson, is to assume a great deal. These blooming times of human power to create beauty and wisdom are among the mysteries of history. Who shall explain the age of Pericles or the glory of the little city of Florence from Dante to Michelangelo, or tell us why Spencer, Shakespeare and Bacon were born within twelve years of each other, or why thirty years of the eighteenth century covered the birth of Lessing, Goethe and Schiller?

Such a blooming time came to France in the seventeenth century, and since its close the production of the French in the sciences, letters and art has been enormous. Mr. Lanson devotes to the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries more than two-thirds of the twelve hundred pages of his *History of French Literature.* For a survey of French achievement in the fields of beauty and of thought from this point on, special manuals must be consulted but the briefest descriptive catalogue of some of the great French writers during the seventeenth century may suggest a part of the huge contribution which modern France has made to the common treasure of mankind.

The great and brilliant galaxy of writers who must be

left unnamed are described summarily in an address on "Popular Culture" by Sir John Morley. "You could scarcely do a hard working man of whatever class a greater service than to teach him . . . to read French with comfort . . . for then he need never have a dull hour. . . . In infinite imaginative variety there is no rival to Shakespeare. In height and majesty Milton and Burke have no masters. But France, besides its *great* men of this loftier sort, has a long list of authors who have produced a literature whose chief mark is its agreeableness. . . . The genius of the French language is its clearness, firmness and order; to these charms the history of French society has added the delightful qualities of liveliness in union with urbanity. Now as one of the most important parts of popular education is to put people in the way of amusing and refreshing themselves in a rational rather than an irrational manner, it is a great gain to have given them the key to the most refreshing and amusing series of books in the world."

The French esteem Molière, Corneille, Racine and La Fontaine as the four greatest of their masters in words. Their works are the outcome and the expression of the distinctive genius of France and their point of view is sometimes more difficult for a foreigner to understand than their melodious and lucid language. It is probably easier for a Frenchman to understand Shakespeare and Goethe than for an Englishman or a German to appreciate fully Molière, and a boy brought up on Hamlet or Faust is perhaps not entirely sensitive to the terror and pity of Corneille. But although northern critics realize this, they place the French masters among the very few of the world's greatest artists.

Molière was born in a well-to-do burgher household of Paris. He studied at the University of Paris, and at the age of twenty-one went on the stage. He acted for some twelve years in the provinces and then for fifteen years

more he was head of a company playing at Paris under royal patronage. He was considered the best comedian of his times, and during the last fifteen years of his life wrote about thirty plays, which have earned him the reputation of the best writer of comedies of all times. Walter Scott said he was the prince of writers of comedy and Goethe felt that the "great Greek Menander" (of whose works only small fragments were then known) was the only writer of comedy "who could be compared with Molière."

La Fontaine had a narrow field of perfection but he is absolute master in it. He was "the most admirable teller of light tales in verse who has ever existed in any time or country and he has established a model which is never likely to be surpassed." [George Saintsbury.]

Pierre Corneille was born in 1606, the son of an advocate of the Parlement of Rouen who was in the service of the bureau of waters and forests. His mother was the daughter of a royal bailiff. He was admitted to the bar and practised for twenty years in the admiralty court of Rouen. The young lawyer began to write plays and, at the age of thirty, won a great popular success with his tragedy of the Cid. The work was, however, so powerfully attacked by the critics that Corneille withdrew to Rouen and to several years of silence. He began to write again and turned out a number of plays of very unequal merit. For his best he received in his own day unstinted praise and the greatest of his younger contemporaries recognized him as their master. For "he could write verses of incomparable grandeur" and "no one has pictured so successfully as he has, the inflexibility and the force of soul which are born of virtue." [Croce.]

Jean Racine came of a family connected with the administration of the salt tax, and his parents, who died when he was an infant, left little or no property. The boy was educated by his grandfather in Jansenist schools

and at the University of Paris. His family wished him to enter the priesthood, but he refused and, at the age of twenty-two, attached himself to the theatre; which the Jansenists regarded with horror. He lived among actors and wrote a series of brilliant dramas in verse which is described by a modern critic as "delicious music." When he was about forty, he abandoned the theatre and married a pious woman who bore him seven children; but never saw one of his pieces on the stage. He became attached to the court as royal historiographer; ostensibly engaged on a history of the reign of Louis XIV, which, during twenty years, never got beyond the stage of scattered notes. About the middle of this period he wrote at the request of Madame de Maintenon two biblical plays, "Athalie" and "Esther," for recital in private theatricals by the pupils of St. Cyr, a girls' school founded by the uncrowned queen. Some critics consider "Athalie" his masterpiece. His exquisite versification and his success in portraying the characters of women, in which he shows a skill like that of Shakespeare, are some of the reasons for his great influence on French drama. He is perhaps the hardest of the great French writers for foreigners to appreciate, and, although his plays still hold the boards, some modern French critics think that "the day is coming, perhaps is already here," when "he will interest only a chosen few of extremely delicate tastes."

René Descartes, who was born in 1596 near Tours of a family of the nobility of the robe, has been called the father of modern philosophy. He initiated a new philosophic method which came to be dominant over French thinkers and influenced many thinkers outside of France who dissented profoundly from it. For his philosophy is a "sort of cross roads whence diverge the chief ways followed by modern thought." He was extremely original, for he deliberately ignored all philosophers who preceded him. He broke as boldly with scholastic thinking as the

artists of France of the sixteenth century finally broke with the traditions of the mediæval gothic. Of all that he learned at school, he cared for nothing but mathematics, in whose history he marks a decisive epoch by the invention of analytical geometry. Rejecting all knowledge based on authority alone (excepting the truths of religion) he made reason the sole judge of truth. Starting from the assertion "I think therefore I am" he proceeds to demonstrate the existence of God from the idea of perfection in his own mind. He shows that this idea could not have come from experience and concludes that it is God's mark upon his consciousness.

"It is said that the man who invented the plow still walks invisible beside the plowing peasant. It might almost be said that, in our laboratories, Descartes stands invisible, investigating with our scientific men the laws of phenomena."

Agrippa d'Aubigné, the grandfather of Madame de Maintenon, had in his youth written ballets for the Valois court. He fought through the Huguenot wars and the wars of the League as a follower of Henry IV and found himself in the seventeenth century—like Milton publishing his "Paradise Lost" after the Restoration—the survivor of a past age. D'Aubigné crowned his literary work by publishing in 1616 his *Tragiques*, a poem of sombre power, which ends with a terrible picture of the impenitent enemies of truth in that part of the invisible world whose ruling passion is "the eternal thirst for an impossible death."

Guez de Balzac is no longer read. He wrote "nothing new and nothing very profound," but, by developing in his *Prince* and his *Letters* the hidden harmonies of the French language and demonstrating the power of a careful choice of words, he prepared the public to appreciate the beautiful phrases of clear and eloquent prose.

Boileau, though not strictly speaking a poet, wrote

chiefly in verse. He was the first writer on literary criticism to help the public estimate books solely on the principles of literary taste. His *Poetic Art*, in spite of its faults, exercised great influence upon French literature. An imitation of it may be seen in Pope's *Essay on Criticism.*

Cardinal de Retz was a descendant of an Italian brought to France by Catherine de Médecis. Forced into the Church by his family, he inherited from his uncle the Archbishopric of Paris and was created a cardinal. He became one of the leaders of the Fronde and spent two years in prison. The last seventeen years of his life he lived in retirement, which enabled him finally to pay his huge debts. Not long before he died, he wrote his *Memoirs*. These are not very scrupulous about exact truth, but show great power of telling an arresting story, illustrated by striking portraits of contemporaries in a style as vivacious as it is careless.

The Marquise de Sevigné was the innocent reporter of the life of a court whose greatest evils she did not share. Her life was not a very fortunate one but her familiar letters breathe "joy and charm" [Sainte Beuve] and display great power of imagination. In a language picturesque though simple in tone, she describes for all generations the life of the nobles of her own day.

The Duke of La Rochefoucauld, descendant of a very ancient family—a great noble and a great cynic—made a collection of over five hundred *Maxims* as cold, as clean cut and as brilliant as the jewels of his Duchess. For example: "A man is never so happy nor so unhappy as he thinks he is." "Hypocrisy is a homage vice pays to virtue." "Nothing is so contagious as example." "In her first passion woman loves her lover; in all the others what she loves is love."

It is rather rare when the greatest orator of any nation is a priest. But the "sublime genius" of Bossuet was de-

voted only to religion. His learning and oratorical skill made him the leader of the assemblies of the clergy. For ten years he preached in Paris or in Versailles and his funeral sermons, over the widow of Charles I of England, or over the great French general, Condé, are among the masterpieces of eloquence. "It is difficult to find in the history of literature any one so preeminently deserving the name of glorious." [Sir Fitz-James Stephens.] Always especially interested in the defense of the doctrines of the Church and believing that the best of defense is attack, Bossuet wrote his *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches;* which was in its day the most effective general criticism of the Protestant position which had been made.

Around Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, there are grouped three other great preachers. Two of them were born within five years of his birthday, while the third was thirty years younger. They are Bourdaloue, professor in several Jesuit colleges, some of whose sermons have become school text books, Fléchier, Bishop of Nismes, whose sermons combine harmonious diction with elegance of form, and Massillon, Bishop of Clermont, admired as a teacher of morality even by succeeding sceptical generations. These men, even Bourdaloue, the greatest of them, suffer by comparison with Bossuet; but not by comparison with other preachers of their own and succeeding times.

In the reign of Louis XIV the French language began that course of peaceful conquest which before the end of the next century had made it the second language of all educated men in western Europe. Higher and lower influences combined to bring this about. The luxury and splendour of the French court aroused envy and imitation. Every German princelet was tempted to squander his tiny resources in a more or less bad imitation of the architecture, the garden craft and the ceremonial of Versailles. Paris became the centre of fashion and luxury

where all high society wanted to buy everything from gloves and perfumes to cheese and truffles. No English household was what was called *comme il faut* without a French maid, a French valet and a French chef, while "the court beauty who could not talk French was little regarded."

Another reason for the spread of French was the polish and intellectual culture of French society, with its characteristic expression in the salon. Leibnitz, a sturdy defender of the use of German against the fashion of talking and writing French, praised the French social reunions (the salons) which 'had imposed on themselves the law of speaking well in conversations, witty and concerned with works of the mind; while the Germans preferred drinking and gambling.'

Finally the clarity, the delicate precision, the ordered grace of these great writers gave to the language they used a charm and a force which spread it everywhere through northern and western Europe. A Spanish traveller of the late seventeenth century wrote: "It is necessary to know French perfectly, not only because of its excellent books but also because it would be hard to find a capital where French is not spoken as well if not better than the native tongue." A century later (1783) the Academy of Berlin, whose official language was French, proposed as the topic for a literary contest this question, "What is it that has made the French language the universal language of Europe?"

The influence of French passed from Europe across the Atlantic, for, in 1771, a rich Virginia planter George Washington wrote to the school-master of his son-in-law: "To be acquainted with the French tongue is become a part of polite education; and to a man who has the prospect of mixing in a large circle absolutely necessary."

PERIOD 9

THE BREAKDOWN OF ABSOLUTISM

1715 TO 1789

The Regent. Louis XV. The Permanent Tasks of Government.
Louis XVI. Turgot and Necker.
Causes of the Revolution. The Constitutional Monarchy.
The New France and the Fall of the Monarchy.
Chapters XLI, XLII, XLIII, XLIV.

CHAPTER XLI

THE REGENT WHO USED POWER BADLY. LOUIS XV WHO USED IT NOT AT ALL. THE PERMANENT TASKS OF GOVERNMENT

When Louis XV became, by the death of his great-grandfather, King of France, he was a beautiful child five years old. The will of the late King lodged the supreme power in a Council of Regency but the will was set aside by the Parlement of Paris, just as the will of Louis XIII had been and Philip of Orleans the King's cousin was declared absolute regent. It is somewhat difficult to see why the Regent had been so anxious to set aside the late King's will, for he made little use of the power he gained by doing so. He was intelligent and cultivated and had shown himself a brave and able general. But he had become debauched, impatient and soft, utterly lacking in tenacity of purpose.

The greatest problem the government had to face was the financial situation. France was in the most terrible straits for money. It was long since the budget had been balanced and the revenues for the coming year were spent before it began, together with almost half the revenues of the year after. In this desperate situation, the Regent accepted the help of a Scotchman who promised to work financial miracles. John Law, the son of an Edinburgh banker, had inherited a considerable fortune. Obliged to flee from England because he killed a man in a duel, he travelled about the world studying banking and credit; about which he probably knew more than any man of his day. In 1716 the Regent licensed him to establish a bank whose notes were good in payment of taxes. Honourable and skilful management sent the notes of the bank to a premium and Law got permission to found the Missis-

sippi Company on a monopoly of trade with Louisiana, which he tried to colonize by forced emigrants. The Company was closely allied with the bank, which became the Royal Bank of France.

The Regent increased the notes from 60,000,000 to 1,000,000,000, and an era of wild speculation set in, like that which took place a year or so later at London in connection with the South Sea Bubble. The Company was given the monopoly of the East Indian trade and Law promised dividends amounting to 120%. After nearly four years, the consequences of the enormous inflation, which had formed no part of Law's original scheme, began to become apparent. The working of Gresham's law was felt as gold was smuggled across the border and hoarded at home, leaving a paper constantly sinking in value as the only medium of exchange. The wild speculation collapsed and Law fled across the border. Some of his highly placed associates had sold out in time with huge fortunes, but he lost the large sum in cash he had brought to France.

Law was succeeded as the most influential man in the state by two cardinals in succession, each of whom had gained influence as a tutor; one of the Regent and the other of the King. The fact that four cardinals reached supreme power in France under Louis XIII, XIV, and XV, whereas the last ecclesiastic to have such great weight in English administration had died more than two centuries before, shows how much French life was involved with the Church. It suggests an explanation of the rage of the extreme revolutionists of the end of the eighteenth century against the Church and all religions. It is also probably the reason why French party politics of today is still complicated by feeling for and against Catholicism to an extent difficult for an American to understand.

The Abbé Dubois held increasing power from 1715

until his death in 1723, a few months before his master the Regent. He finally became premier and a cardinal. As far greater men, Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert, had done, he accumulated a huge income by methods which would now be called dishonest but were not then thought to be so. He formed the Triple Alliance of France, England and Holland to maintain the general European peace established at Utrecht after the wars of Louis XIV. The aggressive policy of Cardinal Alberoni, the Prime Minister of Spain, led the Emperor, whose possessions in Italy were threatened, to make the Alliance quadruple. Spain was invaded and forced to join the Alliance (1520) which gave Europe twelve years of peace.

The death of Dubois brought to power the only man who maintained long continued influence over Louis XV; his ancient tutor Bishop Fleury. He was then 73 years old but rapidly became cardinal and prime minister and held his office until his death in his ninety-first year. It has been said of him that "his only desires were to govern peaceably, to save a great deal of money for the state and to avoid war." Some historians are inclined to laugh over this programme of an honest old man, but it is difficult to question the wisdom of such advice to a King continually on the verge of bankruptcy. Fleury was the first powerful minister for a long time whose honesty was absolutely above the possibility of reproach because he was not rich. He lived in what his contemporaries called a very simple fashion and, at the open table custom compelled him to keep, it was noted with ridicule, and perhaps with regret, that the costly profusion of the banquets of his predecessors was replaced by what was considered the Spartan régime of "four huge platters of entrées, a roast and four desserts."

The peaceful plans of Fleury were interrupted by a strife over the succession to the crown of Poland which began in 1733. Stanislas Leszczynski the father-in-law of

Louis XV had been driven from the throne of Poland by the Russians in 1709. The Polish nobles elected their king and he now appeared as a candidate for reelection. Fleury gave him a large sum of money, he made his way to Poland in disguise and was elected. But a Russian army again drove out the new King who signed his abdication. War became general and Fleury was forced into it. France, allied with Spain and Sardinia, fought Russians and Austrians in Germany and Italy. Hostilities ceased in 1735 and Stanislas received the independent Duchy of Lorraine and a large pension from the French crown in exchange for the crown he had resigned. It was agreed that, at his death, Lorraine should become French. This took place before the end of the reign of Louis XV (1766) and, by that process of peaceful assimilation of which, more than any European nation, France seems to have the secret, Lorraine, long in dispute between Germany and France, has become "one of the most thoroughly French of all the provinces of France."

Three years before his death, Fleury, enfeebled by his great age, was forced to enter the war of the Austrian Succssion, a sterile conflict in which France had much to lose and little to gain. The cause of this war was the failure of the states of Europe to stand by their guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, by which the Emperor Charles VI thought he had secured the peaceful succession to his hereditary dominions of his daughter Maria Theresa. Frederick surnamed the Great, the new King of the new kingdom of Prussia, who had inherited the best army and one of the best organized states in Europe, began the attempt to despoil the young Austrian sovereign by seizing Silesia: one of the striking instances of perfidy and forcible spoliation of a neighbour in an age fertile in such public wrongs. Maria Theresa defended herself with great courage and Frederick withdrew from the conflict with his prey. England and Holland, because of

ancient commercial rivalry with France and Spain, came into the war on the side of Maria Theresa and, after eight years of confused and bloody strife, exhausted Europe made the peace, or rather truce, of Aix la Chapelle in 1748.

At the death of Fleury the King was extremely popular. When he recovered from severe illness there were expressions of joy all over France, and he received the nick-name of the *Well Beloved*. He was then thirty-four and his character or rather lack of character was thoroughly established. He probably had more native intelligence than his father, but he utterly lacked the other qualities which made Louis XIV a great executive. Louis XV was lazy and hopelessly careless, lacking in any sense of duty. His timidity and his frequent monosyllabic conversation might indicate a morbid feeling of inferiority, or they might come solely from morose indifference to everything but his three passions: for hunting, gambling and women. Even these were not strong enough to dispel the hebetude of his spirit and he was intermittently in danger of being bored to death. His debaucheries can by no means be measured by the list of his openly acknowledged mistresses and not even his contemporary Charles II of England sank lower than he into unrelieved carnality.

The list of mistresses begins with three sisters, daughters of a marquis, and ends with a beautiful and clever ex-shop girl of loose life, married to a chevalier du Barry in order that she might be presented at court to captivate the King, for it was very profitable to be a friend of the favourite. During two hundred years the French kings had had mistresses openly, but Louis XV was the first to give them large power in the state. The wife of a commissary in the war department, beautiful, a good musician, a skilled etcher, a clever amateur actress, fought the melancholy boredom of the King for twenty years and

was, during most of that time, the most influential personage in the state. The king created her Marquise de Pompadour.

The Seven Years War which began in 1756 had several causes. The first was the dissatisfaction of everybody with the settlement made in the last general peace; second, there was the commercial and colonial rivalry between France and England, involving supremacy at sea and in India and North America; third, there was the desire of Maria Theresa to get revenge upon Frederick the Great.

The second cause brought on fighting in America and Asia before war began in Europe. In North America the French explored and claimed the watershed of the two greatest rivers, the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi, and began to build a chain of forts to shut the English colonists away from these fertile lands. Fighting between the colonists and their Indian allies had been intermittent and in 1754 broke out into pitched battles. Washington had been compelled to surrender at Fort Necessity; Braddock's army had been all but annihilated at Fort Duquesne, before England declared war on France. In India also French and English soldiers, allied with native princes, had been facing each other on the field of battle. Dupleix, the greatest man France ever had in her Indian service, was brought back in disgrace shortly before the outbreak of war in Europe and died in obscurity and poverty the year it ended—a striking example of the ingratitude of kings.

The diplomatic basis of the Seven Years War was a compact between Austria, Russia, France, the Empire and Sweden for the dismemberment of Prussia. France indeed was to get very little and rather played the part of pulling Austria's chestnuts out of the fire, instead of devoting her chief strength to the conflict at sea where her real interests were at stake. Frederick, King of 4,500,000 people, able to put into the field an army of 150,000

men, found himself at war with governments ruling 90,000,000 of people who put into the field 430,000 men. But Frederick had supreme genius for the art in which, among all the arts developed by man, supreme genius seems most rare: the art of war. His victories were astonishing and he showed himself even more skilful in escaping ruin after defeat, than in winning victory.

In 1763 all sides were exhausted and the war came to an end. France had won some battles, but her army was weakened and her fleet destroyed. Above all her commerce was restricted and of her colonial empire, only fragments remained. The English were dominant in India and America.

The fundamental causes of this latter loss are not however to be found where many historians find them: in the capacity of the English war minister Pitt, nor in the neglect of the French fleet, nor in the superior skill of English admirals, nor in the battle of Quebec. At the time of the war the population of the English colonies was 1,200,000 whites and the population of Canada and Louisiana was only 80,000. For three quarters of a century France had claimed vast stretches of territory which were among the most fertile lands in the world and they still yielded little else but furs. France lost her American colonies because she failed to colonize them. The reason for this failure is well stated by the writer best qualified to express a judgment about the early history of Northern America. "In making Canada a citadel of the state religion—a holy of holies of exclusive Roman Catholic orthodoxy, the clerical ministers of the crown robbed their country of a transatlantic empire. New France could not grow with a priest on guard at the gate to let in none but such as pleased him." [Parkman.] The thousands of Independents, dissidents from the state church, whom even Laud and Charles I allowed to come to New England, might have been matched by three times as many industrious

Huguenots. But neither Louis XIV, nor Louis XV would allow Huguenots in Canada.

After a reign of fifty-nine years Louis XV died of the small-pox in 1774, as his own master of the robes wrote, "degraded and generally despised." Attempts had been made by his ministers to reform the finances—part of the public debt had been, by various devices, repudiated. Under Fleury there had been a temporary improvement and during the first twenty-seven years of the reign of Louis XV, French commerce had quadrupled. Other men had attempted reforms but they were not steadfastly maintained. War and royal extravagance had made things go from bad to worse. Louis XV left to his grandson a bankrupt kingdom.

During the century preceding the death of Louis XV, it began to be clearly perceived in several states of Europe, that large parts of the work done by governments ought to be continuous no matter who was king. There were things that needed to be done without regard to political theories or changes. Hence it was necessary to organize them like any other business and to provide them with a permanent corps of trained experts. In this work of governmental organization France played a leading part and became one of the chief models.

Sully recommended the scientific exploitation and preservation of the royal forests and in 1669 a code of forest laws was enacted and put under the care of a large personnel of inspectors. During the reign of Louis XV, Duhamel, a member of the French Academy of Sciences, wrote the first scientific works on trees and forestry.

On the façade of the great city post office of New York are the following inscriptions:

1. Louis XI—MCCCCLXIV—created the Poste Royale.
2. Cardinal de Richelieu. Public Postal Service. Pierre Dalmeras MDCXXI—Général des Postes.

Under Louis XV, there was a great extension of road building in which Sully had shown marked activity over a century before. At the beginning of the reign the corps of experts of roads and bridges was organized with 21 engineers, 3 inspectors, a first engineer and a director general. In the middle of the century the celebrated École des Ponts et Chaussées was established and, at the accession of Louis XVI, the highways of France were the admiration of the world. An Englishman travelling in France toward the close of the reign of Louis XVI calls some of them "stupendous works, superb even to folly." [Young.] The great canal which connects the Atlantic with the Mediterranean begun under Henry IV and finished under Louis XIV in 1680 "may be regarded as the pioneer canal of the canals of modern Europe." Young called it "a noble and stupendous work."

The police of Paris, in the modern sense, was organized by Louis XIV to secure order, cleanliness and safety. Many streets were enlarged and paved, five thousand candle lanterns were lighted regularly, a fire department was established and a service of public hacks was licensed.

Attempts were made to improve agriculture. The royal *intendants* of the eighteenth century encouraged by exemptions from taxation the drainage of large stretches of marsh and the clearing for cultivation of thousands of acres of wood lands. Committees were formed in many localities of twelve agricultural labourers who met once a week to discuss agriculture. The royal *intendant* presided over their annual meeting which awarded a medal to the best farm in the district. Government nurseries were established to furnish fruit trees and the government distributed turnip seed and encouraged the planting of potatoes. A central bureau of agriculture formed from the Academy of Sciences a committee of agriculture, which carried on a large correspondence with village priests and farmers, and distributed pamphlets on all sorts of agricultural topics. A Royal Society of Agriculture was

founded which, in 1788, unanimously elected that great planter, George Washington, an honorary member. An experimental farm was established and the government imported merino sheep from Spain and bulls from Switzerland and Germany. The first veterinary school in the world was established by the government and "drew pupils from every country in Europe except England."

Social and humanitarian reforms were undertaken by the government. An attempt was made to provide work for the unemployed at government workshops. The first school for the blind was established at Paris with a subvention from Louis XVI, and the first printing in raised characters began. The Abbe de l'Epée became a leader in the instruction of deaf mutes and the development of the sign language.

Thus, even when her own government was breaking down and drawing close to an awful plunge into something near temporary anarchy, France continued to contribute to the civilization of the world.

There prevailed in the latter half of the eighteenth century among the rulers of Portugal, Spain, Naples, Tuscany, Prussia and Austria the idea of *benevolent* or *enlightened despotism,* which taught that the absolute ruler ought to do everything to promote the prosperity and happiness of his people. This idea found its chief source in the influence of French thought, and French writers on social and economic topics were its most efficient apostles.

The pleasure Louis XIV took in the exercise of his marked executive ability, joined to his firm belief that unlimited authority had been put into his hands by God Himself, led him to extend organization and regulation to fields where they did not apply. The commercial system of Colbert aided commerce and industry, but finally repressed that degree of individual liberty of action which, as experience appears to have demonstrated both

positively and negatively, is essential to full and continuing prosperity. When the attempt was made to have all shearing in France done at a certain date, some of the different breeds of sheep obstinately declined to grow their wool according to the law.

The attempt to apply to every branch of human endeavour that logical tendency which is one of the most marked traits of French thought and to create for each of them a *method*, is one of the earmarks typical of Frenchmen towards the end of the seventeenth century. In the arts it created what is known as the *doctrine*. Poetry must be written according to rule and that rule was to be established by the Academy, the sole arbiter, under the king, of literary taste. Art must be taught to youth "according to the ordinances of the King and the *doctrine* of the Academy."

Louis XIV thoroughly believed what Aretino wrote in the beginning of the sixteenth century: "The prince, who reigns solely because he is made in the image of God, ought to imitate the maker of all things whose power built Paradise for the angels and the world for men. . . . And just as everyone of us is astonished looking at the heavens and earth, giving thanks to Him who created them, so the descendants of Your Excellency, wondering at the magnitude of the edifices begun and finished by you, will bless the generous providence of their magnanimous predecessor."

So the splendid King constructed and richly decorated more buildings than any of his predecessors. He loved to study plans for façades, for gardens, for frescoes and all his building and decorating is of the same sort. Through his superintendent of buildings and the first painter Le Brun, he led the artistic imagination of France to accept a norm of beauty, a norm which had begun to form in the end of the reign of his grandfather.

Before the death of Louis XIV, a reaction against the

so called "grand taste" set in. Artists appeared who based their work, not on a study of classic art, but on a realistic sense and a taste for nature. Architecture began to build houses more for comfort and less for splendour. A love of the graceful and the pretty began to conquer admiration for the heroic and the stately. Men and women were tired of the splendid formality of Versailles, which Louis XV abandoned. In everything, from painting and statuary, to tapestries and furniture, the taste for gayety, charm, gracefulness, prevailed more and more until the "style Louis XVI" reached perhaps the highest pitch of refinement and delicacy ever attained by the smaller arts in the service of luxury.

CHAPTER XLII

THE REIGN OF LOUIS XVI, WHO WOULD HAVE BEEN AN EXCELLENT LOCKSMITH. TURGOT. NECKER. FRENCH AID TO AMERICA.

Some suggestion of things belonging to good government done during the reigns of Louis XV and XVI was necessary in order to be just to men who showed themselves as lamentably unequal to an imperative task as any set of men recorded in history. Their failure was due not so much to the things they did as to the things they left undone until it was too late. Unable to guide or control the spirit of the age they were unwilling to accept it. The French Revolution in the end brought great blessings to the world and the ideas which inspired it finally triumphed in a new order of government and society. But, even for one averse to hypothetical history, it is hard to avoid the feeling that if there had been stronger and broader men at the head of the state they might have led the transition from absolutism to democracy without a period of despotism for France, without a Europe drenched in blood, without two generations of reaction against democracy.

The fact that Louis XVI was freer from vices, either of soul or body, than any of his predecessors for generations, a man filled with good intentions, who, if he had been in the family of an artisan, would have lived respected and died regretted by his neighbours, gives an air of homely and pitiful tragedy to his fate. With more chances to show royal qualities than most of his ancestors he was never able to act like a king. He was simple and without pride or vanity. He hated flattery and was very kind hearted. The message he sent to his son from the foot of the scaffold, never to try to avenge his death, was

sincere. But if he died like a "son of St. Louis" he did not live like one. His limited spirit found no inspiration in his terrible task. It frightened him and bored him. Most of his effort and all of his real interest went into lockmaking and hunting, which his doctors recommended as an antidote against his morbid tendency toward obesity. Above all his will was weak and he was extremely suggestible.

Among those whose influence he was unable to resist was his wife, Marie Antoinette. This princess, a daughter of Maria Theresa, had been married at the age of fifteen and crowned Queen of France at the age of nineteen. Like her husband, she hated the formalities of court and found relief in the intimate gayeties of a small circle, which included some princes and courtiers whose reputation was bad. She gambled heavily, to the King's disgust. She went to races and masked balls without her husband. She did things which, to say the least, were undignified in a queen; though, to say the most, they would have been merely indiscreet in an uncrowned woman. Her brother, the Emperor, and her mother, the Queen of Hungary, scolded her for this "frivolity, this dissipated life." Her coterie of friends and her desire to please, drew her into political intrigue to the alarm of her mother and to the great disgust of her brother. The black scandals which gathered around her were due to her own reckless obstinacy, to the venomous tongues of some of her husband's family and finally to the unscrupulous propaganda of political fanatics.

One of the first things the new King did was to recall the ancient parlements, whose members had been dismissed by Louis XV, just at the end of his reign. The parlements were in no sense representative bodies, seats in them had been bought and were hereditary, but they imagined themselves to be the champions of the liberties and laws of the nation. As a matter of fact the fifty

thousand families of the legal profession which furnished the members of the parlements were really interested in defending, not the laws and liberties of the nation, but the privileges of the privileged classes—especially their own.

The King, when he opened the sitting of the restored parlement of Paris, whose legal jurisdiction extended over one third of France, warned them not to take their restoration as a victory over the crown, but as an act of grace on his part. They had, he said, incurred the just wrath of his predecessor and he bade them beware of provoking his disfavour by disobedience. But the parlements, encouraged by great demonstration of popular joy over their reinstatement, paid little heed to the King's words. They repeatedly opposed the royal authority in order to impede reforms which interfered with privilege. The King banished them again, and again recalled them; to find them as recalcitrant as ever. In all this struggle, he always found behind his adversaries a popular feeling he feared to resist, which regarded the parlements as the defenders of law and the maintainers of popular rights. It was not until the eve of the assembly of a body really representative of the nation, the Estates General, that the attitude of the parlements made evident to the nation that their long opposition had been largely a defense of privilege and not a defense of national rights against absolutism.

The parlements were the only strong local authorities left in France, indeed the only institutions which could have carried on any sort of a legal struggle against absolutism. When their power was broken, there was no shock absorber between widespread discontent and a feeble King.

The most conspicuous thing about the government under Louis XVI was its shifting character. There were eight important changes in the ministry in fourteen years. Among the men into whose hands he put the administra-

tion of the state, two stand out; both of unquestionable probity.

Turgot, the son of a provost of the merchants of Paris, had won a name by his writings on political economy and in defense of religious toleration. He had served for thirteen years as royal *intendant* in one of the poorest and most overtaxed parts of France. He began social reforms and did a great deal for the poor in the way of organized charity, using the village clergymen as his agents. He was sincerely attached to the idea of royal authority, for he saw no other means of bringing about imperative reforms. To keep the King in touch with the needs of his people, he planned a series of assemblies, reaching from the parish to the nation, elected by all landed proprietors without distinction of class. These assemblies he thought should have the repartition of direct taxes and the administration of public works, the poor laws and the police.

The most pressing task before him was the saving of France from threatening bankruptcy. He began with rigid economy, setting a good example by cutting his own salary nearly in half and refusing to accept the usual fees which amounted to another forty-five per cent of it. By economy and administrative reforms he balanced the budget so far as annual expenses were concerned and enormously decreased the deficit including the service of debts. These achievements so raised the credit of France that he was able to float a loan in Holland at four per cent.

His strenuous reforms, above all his announcement that he was working toward the abolition of the privilege which exempted the land of the nobles and the church from direct taxation, raised up for him a host of enemies. The Parlement, anxious to defend privilege, every grafter in the kingdom, the higher clergy, the great corporation of the farmers of taxes, the courtiers, angered by economy, with the Queen at their head, all brought

direct and indirect pressure to bear on the King. Turgot, who knew him, wrote frankly: "Never forget, Sire, that it was weakness that brought the head of Charles I of England to the block, that it was weakness which made Charles IX cruel (St. Bartholomew), that it was weakness which formed the League under Henry III." Receiving no answer, Turgot went to the door of the King's cabinet six times in two days and it remained closed against him. The next day the King sent by a secretary a brusque demand for his resignation.

He was followed, as chief minister, by Necker, a Protestant, the son of a professor of international law at the University of Geneva. Necker, who came to Paris at the age of fifteen to serve as a bank clerk, accumulated a large fortune and founded a powerful bank at London and Paris. He had further demonstrated his financial skill by his service on the board of directors of the French East India Company and he added to his reputation by his writings. His appointment as Director General of Finances was hailed with universal applause.

During four years Necker did for the French monarchy all that a man who was a great banker but not a great statesman, could do. He started to consolidate the public debt. He tried to cut down the pensions on which many of the nobles in attendance on the King, lived. He made an effort to clear up the confusion of the system of public accounting. Trusting in his great popularity he issued in 1781 a balance sheet of French finance, which showed a surplus. But, as a matter of fact, it underestimated both receipts and current expenses, omitted a large sum due on the public debt and veiled with reticent optimism a real deficit amounting to fifty per cent of the revenues. The pamphlet had an enormous success and a hundred thousand copies of it were sold in a short time.

Certain things in it excited the anger of the privileged classes and the members of the ministry feared Necker's

dominance. The King yielded again to pressure and dismissed him. Louis XVI had been king for seven years and nothing whatever had been done towards the reforms which seemed most absolutely necessary to all enlightened minds. Five successive heads of public finance of mediocre ability then held office. But, at the end of another seven years, they had accomplished nothing in bringing about financial reforms or in promoting the social reforms which were bound up with them. Then menacing discontent and the pressure of public opinion forced the King to recall Necker (August, 1788).

In spite of the desperate condition of the treasury and the misery of a large part of the population, France was in some ways prosperous. During thirteen years of Louis XVI the total of French commerce had increased and was greater than that of any country except England. It was nearly fifty years after the beginning of the revolution before the total commerce of France was as great as it was in the reign of Louis XVI. The credit of France was still good. One of Necker's successors, the flashy Calonne, had borrowed great sums and his issues of bonds were often rapidly oversubscribed. Bad as the financial situation was, it could probably have been met by a strong-willed and long sustained effort and, after all, the financial situation was the occasion rather than the cause of the great convulsion which was close at hand.

The only part of the government of Louis XVI which showed a continuous intention was its foreign policy. He appointed as minister of foreign affairs Vergennes; an honest man of large diplomatic experience. During the thirteen years which elapsed before Vergennes died in office, his advice in general was in favour of neutrality in all European quarrels. But he helped the American colonies in their revolt against England, at first very cautiously and at last very decisively.

It was only twelve years since the colonists had fought

French soldiers in America, and, in addition, any war was singularly inopportune and burdensome to a state unable to pay its debts or really balance its budget. But three things seem to have brought France to the aid of the American colonies. First, a desire of the King and his minister to lessen the power of England, of which they were afraid; second, among many Frenchmen, an active dislike of England as the chief author of the loss and humiliation of France in the Seven Years War; third, among the liberal intellectuals, a generous enthusiasm for liberty. The cynical Spanish Ambassador thus describes the situation in Paris. "Pamphlets about American liberty were seen on the chimney pieces of salons and the dressing tables of ladies' boudoirs and the 'Letters of a Pennsylvania Farmer,' and other things of the sort, were talked about by all the ladies and all personages of good society; who, filled with enthusiasm for these new ideas, longed to rally to the side of General Washington in defense of wronged liberty. . . . In 1775, when I was in Paris for the second time, it was not possible to present oneself in any company without having read at least some paragraphs of these works in order to be able to join in conversation. . . . The Marquis of Lafayette and other French officers were induced by these ideas, and by the hope of the glory they might gain in protecting American liberty, to go as volunteers to defend it. Publicly disapproved by the King, this resolve on their part was secretly applauded and helped by the government."

The Marquis of Lafayette, possessor of a large fortune and connected with the most influential families of the French nobility, began—by volunteering at nineteen to help our forefathers in their fight for liberty—his generous career of nearly sixty years spent, whenever opportunity came to him, in brave championship of the oppressed and self-sacrificing defense of liberty under law. His friendship with Washington united in affection two

men who incarnated the best qualities of their respective peoples, and the equestrian statue of Lafayette, placed on its high pedestal in front of the Louvre, more than sixty years after his death, by the pennies of the school-children of the United States, is a record of the deep and lasting impression made upon the imagination of the American people by his romantic chivalry.

When Benjamin Franklin, already widely known for his discoveries in physics, came to Paris to ask help, he was the centre of a perpetual ovation. The French government gave, secretly, aid, in powder, guns and munitions of war, so indispensable that it is difficult to see how we could have sustained the struggle without it; unless indeed Washington had been forced to carry out the resolution attributed to him that, if worst came to the worst, he would fall back across the Alleghanies and found a free state in the wilderness. The pretensions of the English government to restrict the liberty of the seas against neutrals rallied all Europe in opposition. French aid became open and finally gave Washington the co-operation of nine thousand French troops and a large French fleet which enabled him to force the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown.

But the victorious American war only made worse the financial embarrassment of France. From all parts of the kingdom word came of refusal to pay taxes and demands for reform. The army could not be trusted, for, in different places the men had refused to fire on the rioting people. Many varying reforms were demanded, but all were united on one point. The King must take council with the nation. The ancient institution of the Estates General, which the kings of France had consulted in trouble and neglected in prosperity, had fallen into desuetude during more than one hundred and seventy years. The absolute monarchy, which had ruled France during that long interval, had made its very name a key to the

dungeons of the King's prisons for him who dared to use it. But now the King saw no escape from the imperious demand of his people and the first Estates General since the reign of Henry IV was opened by Louis XVI the 5th of May, 1789 at Versailles.

The elections to the Assembly had been by very broad suffrage, extending to all males who had reached twenty-five years of age. There were two hundred and ninety-one representatives of the Clergy, of whom two hundred and four were parish priests, all born of the Third Estate and most of them very poor, while most of the forty-eight bishops and archbishops were of noble families and very wealthy. The Nobility sent two hundred and seventy representatives, of whom more than half were officers of the army. The Third Estate outnumbered the two other Estates put together; for the King had been persuaded by Necker to yield to urgent requests from all parts of France to allow the millions of the nation more representatives than the few thousands of the privileged classes. The five hundred and eighty-four deputies of the Third Estate, half of whom were lawyers, were in favour of sweeping reforms; ninety liberal nobles and two hundred parish priests shared their wishes. If the three orders voted together, there was therefore a majority of two-thirds in favour of large modifications of the existing social and political order. But would they vote in one body? For five weeks the Third Estate tried vainly to induce the two other orders to sit with them. Finally the parish priests, led by six liberal bishops and archbishops, were ready to join the Third Estate, and that body proclaimed itself, by a vote of five to one, an assembly delegated by the nation to make for France a constitution.

The King, who in his opening speech had proposed nothing except a few noble phrases and a warning against "the exaggerated desire for innovation which has mas-

tered the minds of men," was horrified. He closed the meeting place of the Estates; ostensibly to prepare for a sitting which he would open. The deputies went to the tennis court and solemnly took oath not to separate until they had made a constitution for France. When they met the King three days later, he annulled all their action and abruptly commanded the three orders to meet in separate assemblies. The Clergy and the Nobility obeyed and left. The Third Estate remained. Therefore the royal grand master of ceremonies said: "You have heard, gentlemen, the orders of the King." The Count de Mirabeau, the leader of the assembly and, perhaps, the most eloquent of French political orators, replied: "Go tell your master that we are here by the will of the people and nothing but bayonets shall drive us out."

The next day two hundred of the Clergy and fifty-six of the Nobility joined the Third Estate. The King gave way by the advice of Necker and ordered the rest of the Nobility and the Clergy to join the Third Estate.

CHAPTER XLIII

THE CAUSES OF THE REVOLUTION. THE CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY

When the Assembly thus openly defied the King, the revolution began. Shrewd observers had foreseen it. Two years before, an English traveller wrote of a dinner party at Paris: "But one opinion pervaded the whole company: that confusion in the finances, a court buried in pleasure and dissipation—a great ferment among all ranks of men, a strong leaven of liberty increasing every hour since the American revolution, all these things indicate that they are on the eve of some great revolution in the government." But no observer could have foreseen the violence concealed within the revolution, nor the widespread power of the reaction produced by that violence. It was more than eighty years after Mirabeau voiced the nation's refusal to obey the King's order before the government of France came again to a position of stable equilibrium and it has been reckoned that, during this time, France had seventeen constitutions. [Adams.]

To try to mention in this sketch all the causes or the striking events of the French Revolution would result in an unreadable catalogue. The history of Lavisse devotes two volumes, each much longer than this, to the ten years from 1789 to 1799.

The chief causes of the revolution were first, misery, not universal nor worse than in many other countries of Europe, but widespread. Young records meeting a peasant woman of twenty-eight whose figure was so bent by labour, her face so furrowed and hardened that she might have been thought forty years older, and he adds that this is the impression given "by infinitely the greater part of

the country women of France." A second cause was a growing revolt in the minds of many men of all sorts against social and political survivals of a feudalism long outworn: The prosperous burghers resented privileges and the growing inefficiency of the government. Finally, and very influential, the revolution grew out of the hope of better things aroused by the widespread reading of liberal political ideas. The financial breakdown was rather the occasion than the cause of the revolution. It compelled the summoning of the Estates General. The new government which resulted from their action added to the bankruptcy of accumulating deficits, the even worse bankruptcy of unlimited inflation.

The causes of the French revolution in the realm of thought and feeling may be indicated around the names of three men of letters; all of whom were dead ten years before the revolution began. France produced in the eighteenth century much so-called poetry but only one real poet, who died under the guillotine at the age of thirty-two. The great writers of the period found expression in prose and they all wrote on serious scientific, moral, social, religious or political, topics. The most outstanding of them both for their skill and for their influence inside and outside of France, were Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau. These men were not friends; Voltaire was a merciless critic of the other two. Nor were any of them democrats, or even in favour of a republic in France. But indirectly they had great influence in bringing about a state of mind which made the revolution possible.

Montesquieu wrote, at the age of thirty, his *Persian Letters*, which satirized unmercifully the social, political and ecclesiastical abuses of France under the Regency. After twenty-seven years of travel and study he published his *Spirit of the Laws;* which has been called "one of the most important books ever written." It had great

influence over the minds of those who wished to make France a limited monarchy on an oligarchical basis something like England. And his influence was great over the moderate reformers who for three years controlled the revolution.

Rousseau was the son of a Genevan watch maker and the daughter of a Calvinist pastor. He led a wandering and more or less miserable life, during twelve years of which he produced masterpieces of literature whose ideas were to have a very strong influence. His three chief works are—*Emile,* a treatise on education which emphasizes the development of individuality as against the transmission of tradition; *La Nouvelle Heloise,* a novel of feeling which endeavours to adjust personal sentiment to social institutions; and *The Social Contract,* a view of society and the state. He put in striking form for his age the ideas which underlay the phrases that government draws "its just powers from the consent of the governed" and that "all men are born free and equal." His writings did much to create the atmosphere in which Liberty, Equality and Fraternity became the motto of the French Republic.

Voltaire, the son of a Paris notary, made, while still young, a literary reputation which brought him a pension from the Queen. A great noble gratuitously insulted him and, getting the worst of the verbal conflict, had his valets publicly beat Voltaire. When he dared to challenge the aggressor to a duel, Voltaire was banished for insolence to a nobleman and spent three years in England; where he gathered many ideas and impressions which he used in fifty years of ceaseless literary activity. His earnings, and skilful investments, gave him the largest fortune which had yet been seen in the hands of a writer, and he became the most notable man of letters, not only of France but of Europe. Out of his enormous correspondence ten thousand letters have survived.

He was a critical mocking spirit who preached disrespect to all authority which could not justify itself to reason in the narrowest sense. His mordant and often vulgar wit was especially used against organized churches and the Bible, to whose authority they appealed. Undoubtedly the intolerance of the churches was the thing which gave its sharpest edge to his attacks upon the Christian religion. He intervened, as in our own day Zola intervened in the case of Dreyfus, to procure the reversal of the sentence of Calas, a Protestant unjustly executed for the murder of his son, and of Serven, another Protestant, falsely condemned for the murder of his daughter. From these cases of injustice, he came to attack the whole working of the criminal law courts with their use of torture, and nobody did more than he toward their reform. He died at eighty-four saying: "I die adoring God, loving my friends, not hating my enemies, and detesting persecution."

These three authors and many other producers of books were supported or attacked by a great army of pamphleteers, writing for a public whose interest in discussion was enormous. Like the Athenians in the days of St. Paul "all the Parisians, and the strangers sojourning there, spent their time in nothing else but to hear or tell some new thing." A flood of little pamphlets was poured out, to meet or express this intense and widespread interest in politics. An Englishman in Paris just after the opening of the Estates General wrote: "The business going on at present in the pamphlet shops at Paris is incredible. At the shop of Deseins and some others one can scarcely squeeze from the door to the counter. Every hour produces something new. Thirteen came out today, sixteen yesterday and nineteen last week. . . . The spirit of reading political tracts, they say, spreads into the provinces. So that all the presses of France are equally employed. Ninety-five out of a hun-

dred of these productions are in favour of liberty and commonly violent against the clergy and nobility. . . . Is it not wonderful . . . that, while the press teems with the most levelling and even seditious principles, not the least step is taken by the government to restrain this extreme licentiousness of publication?"

Another means of political agitation were the political clubs of every shade of opinion which arose at Paris and spread over France. Of these the Club of the Jacobins, so-called from its meeting place in the church of the Jacobins, became the most powerful. It frequently had three thousand at its evening meetings and ultimately corresponded with twenty-four hundred branches scattered over France. The Jacobins were at first moderate reformers and called themselves "Society of the Friends of the Constitution." After the fall of the Monarchy, the club changed its name to "Society of the Jacobins, Friends of Liberty and Equality." It was for a time one of the important supports of the revolutionary cause and supplanted other clubs while its tribunes became one of the chief means of expression for the views of those who wished to extirpate all possible enemies of the Republic by the guillotine. Hence an extremely radical revolutionist, with a tendency to kill those whose political ideas differed from his own, came to be called a Jacobin whether he belonged to the Club or not.

The ferment of these political ideas spread through sodden masses of misery in the wretched hamlets around the château, or the dirty streets behind the palaces, became "the little leaven which leaveneth the whole lump." Evil conditions of life were met by the hope of better things—a new political Gospel—a good news of a new kingdom of heaven—not beyond the grave but here on earth. As the burden of financial ruin caused by war, corruption and royal extravagance fell more and more on those least able to bear it, the descendants grew un-

willing to carry the load their forefathers had endured, they revolted against injustice their forefathers had meekly accepted. They looked to political change to bring in a millennium where all men should be free and equal, brothers of one great human family.

The yielding of the King to the Estates General was only on the surface. It became known that he had given orders to concentrate regiments amounting to eighteen thousand men around Versailles and many of these regiments, called from the frontiers, were filled with Swiss or Germans. Reports, which were not mere gossip, of the use of force to close the Estates General and stop all reform, began to circulate. When the King dismissed and banished Necker, Paris rose in armed rebellion and began to play its enormous part in the development of the revolution.

The municipal government had been, like most of the municipal governments of France, appointed by the King, and did not represent the people at all. The evening of the day after Necker's dismissal, many of the electors who had chosen the deputies to the Estates General, met at the city hall and ordered the assembly of all the sections (wards) of Paris. At five o'clock in the morning the alarm was ringing from every church tower and the most resolute of the people were streaming toward the city hall. In their presence the electors appointed a permanent committee and voted to raise a militia; eight hundred men from each district. Meantime the crowd seized thirty thousand muskets and four cannon at the Invalides, got ammunition in various places and, under the lead of old soldiers, attacked the bastille. This was a huge mediæval fortress, which, with its eight towers, dominated a part of the city. It was defended by only one hundred and ten men and surrendered after a two-hours fight in which the attackers had about a hundred killed or mortally wounded.

Although only seven prisoners were found in it, the great castle was a symbol of despotic power. Built in the fourteenth century for military purposes, it had been used under the last four kings as a prison and had become especially associated with *lettres de cachet*, or royal orders for arbitrary imprisonment without trial or even accusation. During the eighteenth century a number of liberal writers, who dared to criticize, directly or indirectly, absolute government or the aristocratic social system, had been shut up in its gloomy walls. Voltaire had twice been imprisoned in it. For attacking *lettres de cachet*, Mirabeau, now the leader of the Estates, had been driven to take refuge in England. Rousseau had escaped imprisonment only by flight. In the middle of the eighteenth century a witty attaché of the Neapolitan embassy at Paris had defined eloquence as "the art of telling the whole truth without going to the bastille." This is why the fourteenth of July has become to France what the fourth of July is to America, and why Lafayette, who had been elected by the revolutionary city government commander of the new militia, sent the key of the bastille to Washington. It still hangs in the hall of Mount Vernon.

The municipal revolution of Paris was imitated all over France. The cities had, since the time of Louis XIV, entirely lost their rights of local self-government. At the news of the fall of the bastille they universally created local governments, and soon thirty thousand communes lined up with Paris to defend if need be the assembly of the national delegates against the friends of absolutism.

This revolution spread from the cities and towns to the villages and country communities, by a strange, hysterical, psychological movement known as the "great fear." During four days the rumour ran everywhere through the countryside that the "brigands" were coming. Who the brigands were no one knew. In some places it was said that they were the enemies of the people who were

destroying the crops in order to force the people to submission. The tocsin rang and the peasants, armed with everything they could lay hands on, from hunting guns to clubs, assembled before the parish church. When the panic subsided and no enemy had appeared, they decided that the enemy consisted of the feudal seigneurs, their landlords; whose ancient rights and privileges were so many additional taxes added to the heavy burden of the state taxes. So they attacked many châteaux, broke the furniture, plundered all valuables, drank the wine, burnt all title deeds and often the château itself. A few cruel seigneurs were killed, but, in most instances, no blood was shed. The new city governments did not approve of this violence but it was too widespread for them to prevent. It was reported, probably with some exaggeration, that there were three million peasants under arms.

But in all this there was no sign of any movement in favour of a republic. It was an attack upon privilege. The châteaux were often fired with the cry of "Long live the King," and it is necessary to trace briefly how the King lost this rather touching loyalty.

Paris remained excited and suspicious, and both the excitement and suspicion were increased by hunger. There was much lack of employment. Strangers and the wealthy streamed out of the city. In a short time after the fall of the bastille, passports for two hundred thousand people were issued—a number that seems incredible. Bread was scarce. Few people in French cities baked their own bread, and long lines of burghers waited at the doors of the bakers. When they got into the shop they found the bread high in price and poor in quality. So two months after the fall of the bastille, six thousand women met at the city hall and started to march on Versailles with thousands of volunteers armed with pikes behind them. A strong detachment of the new national guard, led, unwillingly, by Lafayette, followed. They brought the King,

the Queen and the Heir Apparent back to Paris in a triumphal procession, the vanguard of which escorted wagons full of wheat and flour while some national guards carried a loaf of bread on their bayonets. The women sung good-naturedly around the royal carriages. "We are bringing back the baker, his wife and the little baker's man." The royal family was received by a huge crowd at the city hall with delirious enthusiasm. After one hundred and twenty years Paris had the King back again.

For twenty months, the King lived in the Tuileries. Then, in June 1791, he made a clumsy attempt to escape, disguised as a valet, to the border, where, in the midst of loyal troops and with an Austrian army near by ready to help, he could dismiss the Estates and, if need be, begin civil war. He was stopped near the border and brought back to Paris, where he remained, virtually a prisoner, in his palace while the deliberations of the Constituent Assembly continued. After a little more than two years work, the constitution was finished (Sept. 1791) and the King, in the presence of the delegates of the nation, twice accepted it and swore to defend it within and without the realm. Some months before, the elections for the first regular Legislative Assembly had been ordered and, in the autumn of 1791, the Estates (now called the Constituent Assembly) dissolved and made way for the first representative assembly of the new constitutional Monarchy.

CHAPTER XLIV

THE NEW FRANCE. THE FALL OF THE MONARCHY

The work of the Constituent Assembly was not only long but complicated. Part of it was rejected by the nation within a year, but much of it survived and furnished, in spite of years of reaction and suppression, the inextinguishable germinal ideas for the final triumph of liberty and equality among the nations of Europe. The idea of fraternity, emphasized in the later stages of the revolution, does not seem to have yet triumphed entirely among the nations of the world.

The National Assembly began its work by a "Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen." Its ideas had been expressed during more than a century before by Dutch, English, French, Swiss and Italian writers and they were the common property of liberal thinkers all over the world. But George Washington took the oath as first President of the United States five days before the opening of the Assembly at Versailles, the chief documents relating to the establishment of the new American Republic were accessible to everybody in translations and therefore the American version of the common progressive political ideas had an "irresistible" (Sagnac) influence.

Scarcely less strong was the influence of certain current English political ideas. Chateaubriand, then a youth of twenty-one, wrote later describing the situation: "Alongside a man with powdered head and a sword at his side, shod in pumps and silk stockings, walked a man whose unpowdered head was cropped, wearing an English coat and an American cravat."

But, in spite of the fact that the Archbishop of Bor-

deaux, secretary of the committee to draft the French Declaration, declared that it was an imitation of the American documents, its spirit is as French as its language in the assertion of the three "natural and unprescriptible rights of man, liberty, property, security against oppression." For guidance in its work of writing the first constitution for France, the Assembly had the *cahiers,* which, according to ancient custom, presented in writing the complaints and requests of the provinces. Formed by successive amalgamations and reductions, they were a series of composite photographs of the sufferings and hopes of the three chief classes of Frenchmen in the different provinces.

Although the members of the Third Estate had been elected by almost universal suffrage, they established a rather high property qualification for voters and representatives. In doing this they were perhaps to a large extent following the example of the United States but they wanted to put the control of the government into the hands of the middle class. For there were then only a handful of democrats in France and no one in the Assembly spoke openly for a republic. They wanted to establish a limited monarchy; like England in that the majority of the people could not vote, but unlike England in that the new French Monarchy was to have no aristocracy.

The royal title was changed from "Louis by the grace of God King of France," to "Louis by the grace of God and the constitutional law of the state, King of the French." The power to make laws and the control of the purse and the sword were taken away, but he had the title of commander in chief of the army with power to name the marshalls. The sale of commissions in the army and the rules restricting them to men of noble birth, were abolished and the "career opened to talents."

The whole judicial system of Parlements with their

memberships bought and hereditary, was swept away and replaced by elective judges. Trial by jury was decreed for criminal cases, and the use of torture was prohibited. Freedom of religion was established and a Protestant pastor was elected a President of the National Assembly.

The ancient provinces of France, which had grown out of historical causes, racial, linguistic, feudal, were abolished and replaced by eighty-three departments, named chiefly from geographical features, like the Departments of, The High Alps, the Mouths of the Rhone, the Lower Seine, etc. This rearrangement of local units, together with the substitution of one national assembly for the old provincial assemblies, brought about the first thorough unification of France. The government Louis XVI inherited was still like the feudalism of the twelfth and thirteenth century in one respect. There were in it plenty of lines leading from top to bottom, but few side lines connecting the parts. The perpendicular lines all ended in the King and the realm was a bunch of things hung to the crown. It needed the great melting pot of the revolution to fuse them finally into France.

One of the most marked results of the National Assembly was the destruction of the privileges of the nobility and the clergy. It was equality even more than liberty that the French people demanded. Church land and noble land paid no tax and in other taxes the noble was less burdened than the commoner. The mass of the people blamed on this the financial distress of the state. The feudal nobility had lost ability to resist a king, but not all facility for oppressing those who farmed their lands. They had all sorts of rights, ranging from power to keep game in their forests, or pigeons in their cotes, which devoured the crops, to customs which made of the farmer a serf bound to the soil. Less than a month after the fall of the bastille the liberal nobility and clergy offered to give up all their exemptions and privileges. The As-

sembly, indeed, voted that some of them were vested rights for which the holders must be reimbursed, but it was the beginning of the end of all noble privilege.

The clergy, when the Estates General met, was a distinct order in government and society, consisting of 130,000 people; divided into higher clergy, bishops, abbots, vicars, canons; and the parish clergy, together with monks and nuns. The parish clergy and most of the monks and nuns, were of humble social origin. The bishops, elected and confirmed on the royal nomination, were almost all younger sons of great noble families like Montmorency, Rohan, La Rochefoucauld, Talleyrand—Perigord, etc. Some of the sees were enormously wealthy and the incumbents resided a great deal at Paris. If they went to their dioceses it was to hunt or give magnificent entertainments; rarely to do their duty in visiting remote parishes under their pastoral care.

The National Assembly made the Church a part of the state and put it under lay control. Religious orders were abolished. There was to be a bishop for every new department, eighty-three instead of one hundred and thirty-five, chosen among the clergy of the diocese by the electoral assemblies of the departments. Bishops were forbidden to ask papal confirmation. The parish priests were to be elected by the communities they served. The government was to pay the salaries of the bishops and parish clergymen, graduated according to the population of their dioceses and parishes. The entire property of the Church was taken by the nation. When some of the clergy denounced from the pulpit the whole or part of this arrangement, the Assembly voted that every clergyman exercising public functions should be compelled to swear to maintain with all his power the constitution. Those who refused were to be deprived of their benefices. A considerable number of the bishops and more than half the parish priests took the oath. Later, for a time, the "unsworn"

clergy were allowed to say mass in private, provided they did not criticize the law. But such a declaration of liberty was too advanced for men as intolerant in political opinion as their ancestors had been in religious opinion. "unsworn" priests were finally proscribed and numbers of them perished as martyrs for conscience sake.

It was hoped that the confiscation of the property of the Church would accomplish two objects: a wider distribution of land and the extinction of the public debt. The sale at auction of the huge mass of ecclesiastical lands, together with the domains of the crown, did aid distribution, but not as much as was hoped. The attempt to extinguish the public debt was a failure. The state issued paper money "assignats" guaranteed by the public lands. These were to be used to pay the creditors of the government and to provide buyers with money for the purchase of state lands. They were to be burnt in proportion as the lands were sold. But they were not burnt. On the contrary, issue after issue was put out and their value fell. Bankruptcy was perhaps inevitable no matter what was done and inflation only made things worse. Prices rose faster than wages and the chief burden of economic suffering fell as it always does, on the poorest.

The first Assembly under the constitution of the limited monarchy met October 1st, 1791. None of the members of the previous Assembly could sit in it. Partly in consequence of this, the list of its seven hundred and forty-five members contained fewer distinguished names than the roll of the body which called it into being.

The first element of the situation which demanded attention was the *emigrés,* or nobles who had been fleeing from France during the two years since the fall of the bastille, until now twenty thousand of them were assembled at Coblentz. The Assembly voted a law declaring all *emigrés* under suspicion of conspiracy and gave them

two months to return to France. The penalty for refusal was confiscation of property and death.

The second dangerous element was the threatening attitude of the Emperor (also King of Hungary and Bohemia). France determined to strike first, and the Assembly accepted the King's proposal of war against the King of Hungary and Bohemia with a minority of only seven votes. France, orators said, would answer a coalition of kings in defense of the divine right of absolutism, by calling the peoples of Europe to arms in defense of the divine right of liberty. The long war now begun, took on more and more the aspect of what it really was, the reaction of absolutism against liberty, and the desire of the advocates of liberty to spread their doctrine through the world. Of the three northern armies of France, one was commanded by Lafayette and another by Rochambeau, leader of the French force which had enabled Washington to take Yorktown. The King by secret messages to other sovereigns explained that he hoped for the overthrow of the constitution he had repeatedly sworn to defend, and the Queen sent to her relatives of the House of Austria secret strategical plans adopted in the royal council.

From the first, things went against France. Her armies were disorganized by the fact that six thousand out of nine thousand officers (all nobles) were *emigrés*. Two French invading columns fled in disgraceful panic, one killing their general and the other throwing away their arms and crossing the frontier a terrified mob.

In the face of this situation, the Assembly solemnly declared the country in danger and France rose in arms in defense of her new found liberties.

Paris, led by two of its forty-eight districts, began to exercise great pressure on the Assembly and to denounce all in favour of a constitutional monarchy based on limited suffrage as aristocrats and secret conspirators anxious to

undo everything that had been done. In June, 1792, a mob from four sections of Paris, excited by the refusal of the King to sign certain decrees, broke open the door of the Assembly and paraded through the hall brandishing axes and pikes. Then they broke into the Tuileries and took possession of it for hours. The King put on a red cap of liberty and drank with a national guard "To the French nation."

Five weeks later forty-seven out of forty-eight sections of Paris demanded that Louis XVI should be dethroned and this attitude was backed by other cities. Brest, for example, sent a body of armed citizens to Paris and a young Parisian advocate from Marseilles asked the mayor of that city for a battalion of men "who know how to die." The end of July, five hundred men selected from the national guard of Marseilles and neighbouring cities, arrived at Paris. During their long march they had sung everywhere the "war song for the army of the Rhine" recently composed at Strassburg by a young officer. They introduced it to France and gave it the name of *La Marsellaise*. It breathes the indomitable energy of lovers of liberty who feel they are fighting for her life against "the bloody standards of conspiring kings." "To arms, citizens, form your battalions, Forward! Forward! Until the foul blood of tyrants soaks our furrows." The fierce nervous tension of its readiness to kill and be killed for France and liberty, throws light on the possibility of some of the grim events of the following year.

The Duke of Brunswick, commander-in-chief of the Austrian and Prussian armies, poured oil on the flames of hatred and suspicion by a proclamation which reached Paris in July, 1792. It declared that all national guards taken with arms in their hands should be put to death together with the inhabitants of all cities or villages which defended themselves against his troops. If the palace of the Tuileries was again insulted, Paris would be utterly destroyed.

The answer to this threat was given by the majority of the sections of Paris, who formed a revolutionary city government during the night of the ninth of August and the next day attacked the Tuileries. The King, with the Queen and his son, took refuge with the Assembly. A desperate fight followed in which the men from Brest and Marseilles joined. The people had three hundred and seventy-six killed and wounded. The defenders lost six hundred out of nine hundred Swiss guards and two hundred gentlemen of the court. The disproportion in loss is probably accounted for by the fact that, when the palace was finally stormed, no quarter was given. Some of the dead Swiss were even ferociously mutilated. The attackers destroyed furniture and works of art, but hung to the lantern those who tried to steal.

The same day the Assembly suspended the King, established universal suffrage and ordered the immediate election of a new Constitutional Convention. At the demand of the new revolutionary government of Paris, the royal family was imprisoned. Lafayette apparently wished to get the two other northern armies to join him in resisting the destruction of the monarchy. But even his own army would not stand by him and he fled across the border with twenty-five of his officers. It has been said that when he changed his uniform as an American general for that of a French general, he changed from a republican to a monarchist; which is only another way of saying that he thought France was not yet prepared for a republic—and events, up to the time of his death, endorsed his judgment. He might have made a greater career for himself if, like so many men in political life before and after him, he had been willing to maintain his influence by doing what he thought it wrong to do.

The Assembly named ministers to form an executive council. Danton, a young advocate, president of the great political club of the Cordeliers, and administrator of the department of Paris, was appointed minister of justice.

The best orator and ablest statesman since Mirabeau, he speedily became the dominant influence in the policy of the new republic. His fiery eloquence made him the most conspicuous political figure of a moment full of danger to a revolution which had now become democratic. It was in vain that the new government disavowed, in a circular sent to all Europe, any intention of conquest or even of liberal propaganda. The invasion of France was pushed, and the great fortress of Verdun surrendered. The executive council, with the exception of Danton, was panic stricken and talked of withdrawing to Blois, but the revolutionary government of Paris called for sixty thousand volunteers. Its representatives also ordered the terrible loosing of vengeance, fear and cruelty, known as the September massacres.

In all the revolutionary demonstrations of the people of Paris, although they were never mere unorganized mass movements, there had always been a mob element and from that element had come displays of the contagious ferocity which is one of the strong impulses of mob psychology. This ferocity had been fed on suspicion and vengeance by some of the early orators of the Revolution, beginning with Mirabeau, who made vague allusions to a St. Bartholomew of patriots planned by their opponents. It is doubtful, however, if all this would have caused the savagery of the September massacres without some distinct personal lead. The responsibility for it has been laid at the door of Danton, Robespierre and Marat, three men, none of them born in Paris, who had great influence among the people of Paris. Danton might perhaps have been able to stop them but the only one whose responsibility is positive and directly traceable is Marat.

He had been one of the court physicians. Widely read in English, Spanish, German and Italian natural philosophers, his writings on medicine and science had drawn visits from Benjamin Franklin. Since the beginning of

the Revolution he had been publishing a paper called the *Friend of the People*. It became so violent that he was obliged to remain in hiding to avoid arrest by the early revolutionary authorities. But, even when he was hiding, his paper continued to demand the summary killing of traitors. His popularity among the common people after the storming of the Tuileries was enormous and he had no difficulty in being elected member of the Committee of *Surveillance* of the *Commune* of Paris, where his influence soon became dominant.

Nine prisons in Paris were filled with thousands of prisoners. Some of these were ordinary criminals and there were many debtors, but they were mostly survivors of the Swiss guard of the Tuileries, hostages for *emigrés* or suspected aristocrats, and priests who refused for conscience sake the oath of allegiance. At the demand of six of the forty-eight sections of Paris, the Committee of *Surveillance* of the *Commune* sent killers to the prisons who killed with pike and club numbers of their inmates estimated between 1,000 and 1,400. There was the semblance of an examination but in some places the slaughter became entirely indiscriminate. About two hundred thieves and debtors were killed. In one prison there were prostitutes and a number of them were killed. Another, partly a house of correction, contained many boys, most of whom were killed. The slaughter lasted five days, during which there was no general rioting, for the bloody bands were never larger than two hundred in number. Some of their members were paid by the committee of their section for their time.

While the massacres were still going on the Commune of Paris sent to all the departments of France a circular to inform them that "part of the ferocious conspirators in its prisons had been put to death by the people, an act of justice absolutely necessary to hold down by terror thousands of traitors hidden within the walls of Paris at

the very moment when the volunteers were marching against the enemy." But almost all the departments took the same attitude toward the appeal of Marat which the majority of the provinces had taken toward the similar appeal of the crown after the massacre of St. Bartholomew and refused to follow it.

Two weeks later came the news of the battle of Valmy, where the French army, in a strong position, had stood so firm under a heavy cannonade that the celebrated Prussian infantry did not risk an assault. The new recruits of the Republic proved, like our ancestors at Bunker Hill seventeen years before, that they could fight. An army of national militia not led by "*gentlemen*" had held its own. Goethe, who was present with the Prussian army, said: "Here and now begins a new epoch in the history of the world."

The day of Valmy, the National Constitutional Convention began its sessions and two days later the Republic was formally established.

PERIOD 10

THREE GENERATIONS OF UNSTABLE EQUILIBRIUM

The Republic and Her Enemies. The Terror.
The Reaction.
Napoleon.
The Re-established Kings and the Two Revolutions They Provoked.
The Second Republic. The Second Empire.
Chapters XLV, XLVI, XLVII, XLVIII, XLIX, L.

CHAPTER XLV

THE REPUBLIC AND HER ENEMIES. THE BLOODY POLITICAL INTOLERANCE OF THE TERROR

The second Constitutional Convention had been chosen in elections where all male citizens twenty-one years of age could vote. Of seven hundred and sixty-five members, two hundred and seventy had sat in one of the two previous Assemblies. It contained twenty-nine former nobles, sixteen bishops, twenty-seven priests and ten Protestant ministers. One third of the members were lawyers and more than half had held a local governmental office. They were therefore not lacking either in education, training in administration or in public experience. Nevertheless M. Pariset thus describes the Assembly: "Ringing resolutions whose causes remain obscure, intensive quarrels and persistent personal attacks, self-contradiction and feebleness . . . dramatic incidents interrupting serious discussions—these were to be seen in the first week of the convention and remained characteristic during the whole three years of its session." Four days after the opening Marat, one of the deputies from Paris, brandished a pistol in the tribune and threatened to kill himself if the Convention ordered his arrest for the September massacres and the continued efforts of his newspaper to stir up the people to demand more bloodshed.

The new Republic had a relief from immediate danger, for Valmy was followed by the marked success of French arms. The King of Sardinia was driven out of Savoy, whose people asked to be incorporated with France. This was finally done on more liberal terms than those on which Porto Rico was made part of the United States.

Dumouriez, the ablest general France had yet found, beat the Austrians at Jemappes (November 1793) in the first pitched battle won by the new volunteers, who charged with the bayonet all along the line, singing the *Marseillaise*. A month after the battle, all Belgium was conquered and annexed to France, together with the country between the Rhine and the Moselle.

During this breathing space, which lasted about five months, the Convention developed three groups or factions, none of them organized into a party in our sense: the left was the *Montagnards* or mountaineer men (because they sat on the high benches); the right was the *Girondists* (because many of their leaders came from the department of the Gironde); and the centre was called the Plain. It had no policy of its own and at first followed the *Girondists*. They counted about a hundred and sixty deputies, the bulk of whom came from the south and the northwest, but there were others scattered all over France. The real centre of the group and the strongest inspiration of its leaders was Madame Roland, wife of a man who served as minister of the interior.

The core of the Montagnards consisted of the delegation from Paris and the districts immediately around Paris; though they had members elected by distant constituencies. They were at first in a decided minority of the Convention. They had, however, very great influence in the city of Paris; especially in those sections of it which felt the scarcity of bread most and had shown themselves the most disposed to bloody action.

It is not easy to see any principles which separate the Girondists from the Montagnards. Both groups were believers in the Republic and when she seemed unmistakably in imminent danger they acted together. There was one point on which they differed, and that was really a practical point. The Girondists thought Paris had exercised too much influence over the Revolution and had now

too much influence over the Convention. This feeling was increased by the "demonstrations" made repeatedly by the Commune in which armed men half mobs paraded before or through the hall of the Convention. It was partly the result of that jealousy of the influence of Paris which still exists in France of to-day and now somewhat resembles the feeling in parts of the west against New York and the alleged diabolical financial machinations of Wall Street. But in 1793 this feeling was far more serious. The departments sent up guards for the Convention amounting to five thousand men, who after a time were sent back. The Montagnards on the other hand believed in the leadership of Paris as necessary to fight the war and as the chief pillar of their own political power.

These two factions, the Girondists and the Montagnards, acted together in bringing the King to trial before the Convention as a traitor, and the vote on his fate did not follow party lines. He was unanimously declared guilty of conspiracy against the security of the state; and, indeed, documentary evidence left no doubt that he had repeatedly broken his repeated solemn promises to maintain the constitution. On the question of the penalty, the vote was extremely close. It took three hundred and sixty-one votes, a majority of all the members of the Convention, to condemn. On the first vote there were three hundred and sixty-six who voted for death; on the last ballot of recension, a change of one vote would have saved the prisoner's life.

Thomas Paine, whose "Common Sense" was probably the most influential argument in defense of the American Revolution, had been created an honorary citizen by the Legislative Assembly. He was unable to speak French. But admiration for the American Revolution was so strong that he was elected to the Convention by four constituencies. He made every effort possible to save the King's life, asking that he should be banished to America

and insisting that the death of their benefactor would offend the people of the United States. This activity was one of the things that afterwards brought him ten months' imprisonment, when he considered himself in danger of the scaffold.

Certainly the Convention had need of unity. England, Spain and the Empire were added to her enemies, and, by the spring of 1793, the new Republic was at war with half Europe. This war was not caused by the execution of the King. Europe would no more have fought France because the head of Louis XVI fell under the guillotine, than Europe fought England a century before because the head of Charles I fell under the axe. The execution of Louis might be denounced in the English parliament as "the foulest and most atrocious deed attested by the history of the world," but none of the rulers were fighting merely to avenge a brother king. They were fighting an aggressive, expanding, France, whose orators joined Danton in declaring: "The limits of our Republic are marked by nature from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, the ocean to the Alps. Those are the border lines of our Republic and no human power shall be able to prevent us from reaching them." They were fighting also a propagandist republic, not content with mere self-defense. Brissot, the leader of the Girondists, declared: "This is a combat between French liberty and universal tyranny and we cannot be at peace until Europe, and all Europe, is in flames."

The *Journal des Debats* said on September 2nd, 1927: "Since the avowed aim of the Soviet government is the destruction of western civilization . . . to continue official relations with such a government is absurd." To extreme conservatives of the end of the eighteenth century, who worshipped aristocracy, believed in the divine right of kings, and thought democracy an inspiration of the devil, declarations like those cited may have seemed to announce a force bent on ruthlessly destroying western civilization.

To many men of that generation liberty was a word more dangerous than dynamite.

Pitt, when he brought England into the war against France, was not fighting for abstract political principles. He was not really waging what one of his opponents in the House of Lords called "a metaphysical war." He was following old policies of the English foreign office which did not want Holland and Belgium in the hands of France, nor the opening to navigation of the Scheldt. But in his great speech before the House of Commons which presaged war, he began with a scathing attack on the "abominable and detestable principles" of the Revolution; (which were also the "principles" of the Declaration of Independence and other documents of the American Revolution). He denounced them as "contrary to every principle of law, human and divine," as striking directly at the "authority of every regular government and all lawful sovereigns" and he called on England to take measures "to avert their contagion and prevent their progress in Europe." It is not to be wondered at therefore that, to French imagination, he became the chief source of all the dangers of France; a sort of devil attacking her gospel of liberty. It was one of the things which sent Mme. du Barry to the guillotine when the prosecutor of the revolutionary tribunal said she had been in conference with "That infamous monster Pitt, the implacable enemy of the human race."

In the face of the attack of the five chief powers of Europe, Dumouriez, the victor at Jemappes and the ablest general of the Republic, tried to lead his army on Paris to overthrow the government, and restore the constitutional monarchy. In spite of his great popularity with the soldiers, the army refused to follow him and he was obliged, like Lafayette, to flee across the border. Two weeks before, word had reached Paris that the Vendée, a large tract of country in the west centre of France, had

risen in revolt. The discontent had its roots in dislike for military conscription and for the action taken in regard to the Church. It was not at first a revolt for the King. Nor was it led by the aristocracy, for the first outstanding leaders were the son of a mason, a wigmaker and a surgeon. It was later that the nobles and clergy turned the revolt toward monarchy. Although the Vendeans sometimes had thirty thousand men in the field, their armies were never permanent, and the struggle was a dragging guerrilla warfare. Not much quarter was given by either side and the struggle became even more savage than the wars about religion of the sixteenth century. The number who finally perished in the conflict is reckoned from two hundred thousand to five hundred thousand.

In the face of this danger from without and within, the dissensions of the Convention were suspended. Girondists, Montagnards and men of the Plain voted unanimously to do two things, to create a dictatorship in commission and to begin a reign of terror. A Committee of Public Safety was elected, consisting finally of twelve men. Seven were lawyers, two men of letters, two retired officers of the engineer corps, and one was a Protestant pastor. They were elected for a month but generally reelected. They came to have enormous power but they were absolutely dependent upon the Convention. Many of them were able and there was among them one man of genius, a captain of engineers named Carnot, who acted as minister of war and chief of staff, put on foot fourteen armies and earned his title of "the organizer of victory."

Associated with this Committee, but somewhat subordinate to it, was the Committee of General Security, which managed the police of France with summary powers. At the end of a year of its operation there were nearly eight thousand suspects in the prisons of Paris.

This was the necessary preliminary for "The Terror," which the dictatorship in commission was instructed by the Convention to carry out. The Committee, who had been armed to fill the prisons by special laws which made it possible to arrest any one, were then armed to empty them by the creation of a special revolutionary tribunal which was finally expanded to sixteen judges and sixty jurors; so that it might sit in sections. All these laws were voted by Girondists as well as by Montagnards, and they expressed the feeling of the Convention that the Republic was in great peril. The committee of dictatorship and the revolutionary tribunal with its laws, were always spoken of as temporary war expedients to meet a dangerous crisis.

Meanwhile the Montagnards gained in numbers slowly, till they were about equal to the Girondists and larger than the Plain. Although the Montagnards lacked a majority they were able to call in an element which gave them an ever-growing control over the Convention. This was the people of Paris; more especially those sections of Paris where the hand workers lived. Their repeated disorderly demonstrations in the hall of the Convention were much resented by the Girondists. Toward the end of May 1793 the Girondist President said: "If in the course of these constantly recurring demonstrations, it should ever happen that the national representatives were subjected to violence, I declare to you, in the name of all France, that, in a little while, one might search the banks of the Seine to discover whether Paris had ever existed"; and the Convention by a formal vote approved the words of the President.

The answer to this attitude was an insurrection of Paris which put the government of the Commune under the control of a committee claiming to represent the people of the sections. The new city government sent a delegation to the Convention with fourteen demands including the

arrest for treason of twenty-two Girondists, the increase of the revolutionary tribunal, a forced loan of a thousand million francs upon the wealthy, etc. The Convention took no action and two days later found itself invested by thousands of soldiers of the national guard, horse, foot and artillery, which would allow no one to leave the hall. At last, after hours of forced session, worn out and hungry, they ordered the arrest of twenty-nine Girondist deputies who had been denounced by the insurrectionary Commune. Seventy-five deputies who signed a written protest were also ordered under arrest and forty-one other deputies were summoned before the revolutionary tribunal. So that, in all, nearly one hundred and fifty national deputies were proscribed and in imminent danger of the guillotine.

It is therefore not to be wondered at that the meetings of the Convention were henceforth not very large; the average vote was only one third of the six hundred and eighty-six members still on the roll and, on some questions, only fifty votes were counted. The Convention fell completely into the hands of the Montagnards and the two committees were filled with their partisans.

Gouverneur Morris, the minister of the United States and the only foreign minister left in Paris, wrote to Washington, four months after the Convention had been forced to vote the arrest of the Girondists: "The Convention now consists of only a part of those chosen to frame a constitution. These are putting under arrest their fellows, claim all power and have delegated the greater part of it to a Committee of Safety." This description, although from a witness not always accurate but always hostile to the new republic, puts the situation incompletely but not unfairly.

The Montagnards soon dominated not only the Convention but the whole of France. The arrest of the Girondists had, indeed, caused insurrections in about two-

thirds of the departments. But the forty odd thousand communes, for the most part, stood by the government of the Montagnards; as more resolute and capable than their rivals. When a levy of all men able to bear arms was ordered to defend the country in danger, the peril of general civil war evaporated in the impulse to defend the Republic against a hostile world. Two months after the Commune of Paris had forced the Convention to order twenty-nine of its own members under arrest, the insurrections which the escaped deputies started had all died out; except in four cities, Lyons, Bordeaux, Marseilles and Toulon. These were soon reduced; except Toulon, which was captured and held by the English fleet.

The fact that these Girondist insurrections declared for the restoration of the constitutional monarchy, while new leaders of the Vendean rebels declared that they would put "the sign of the cross and the royal standard against the bloody flag of anarchy," made all Republicans still further averse to them—and the majority of Frenchmen who were anxious to take any part in political affairs, were now in favour of the Republic. The popular vote on the constitution which established the Republic took place the month following the rising of Paris which put the Montagnards in power. More than one million eight hundred and fifty thousand voted yes and twelve thousand seven hundred and sixty-six no. But there were seven million who had the right of suffrage and nearly three-quarters of them did not care to use it.

The revolutionary tribunal established by the Convention in March, had been working steadily, but the figures suggest an evident attempt to distinguish between those really guilty of plotting against the Republic and those it was possible for the hysterical public feeling to suspect. In April and May it pronounced eighteen death sentences. In June, July, August and September, one hundred and seventy-nine were acquitted and forty-eight condemned

to death. With October the new Committee of Public Safety began to carry out the demand of the Jacobin Club and the new Commune of Paris "to place the Terror on the order of the day"; by which they meant to work the guillotine faster. The government granted this wish, not by the influence of this or that man, but by the deliberate votes of the two committees which had the executive power and the control of the police. The surviving documents give the "lie direct" (Aulard) to the later excuse of their ablest member, Carnot, that he was so busy raising armies that he signed warrants leading to the scaffold without reading them.

In a little over eight months from October 1793 to the 10th of June 1794 nearly twelve hundred people were executed. Commissioners sent to the departments carried the guillotine and summary powers of judgment. Some of these acted with humanity. Some, like the ex-lawyer Carrier at Nantes and the ex-priest Lebon at Arras, committed terrible cruelties. At Paris the revolution devoured its own children who had led the revolt against absolutism and the defense of the new Republic. The Girondists waiting their turns at the foot of the scaffold sang the Marseillaise, until, one by one, their voices were stilled by the knife. Madame Roland, who had been their centre and inspiration, died a week later. To dissent in any way from the policy of the Committee of Public Safety was fatal. Hébert, one of the leaders of the Commune of Paris, perished with his friends because he wanted an even bloodier terror and two weeks later Danton and his friends were railroaded to the scaffold by the committee and the tribunal because they advocated a lessening of the terror, now that the peril of invasion and insurrection had decreased.

The dictatorship in commission even put to death men who under any form of government would be among the glories of France. Bailly, who had been the first presi-

dent of the Third Estate in the Estates General of 1789, was one of the leading astronomers of Europe with a fame which extended to all civilized countries. He was sent to the guillotine. A little later the great chemist Lavoisier perished on the scaffold; of whom von Liebig wrote: "His immortal glory consists in this, that he infused into the body of the science of chemistry a new spirit. . . . Among the pioneers of modern civilization there is no more honoured name than his." An influential Jacobin who was implored to save him is said to have replied, "The Republic has no need of learned men"; a reply as false as it is ungrateful. It was Pasteur himself who pointed out in 1876 that France had held her own in 1792 because "science gave to the courage of our fathers the material means for fighting and winning." He mentions a half dozen great scientists who were "the soul of the immortal mass of scientific labours which enabled France to resist the coalition of Europe. They taught how to make steel rapidly, to hasten the tanning of leather to give the soldiers shoes, to collect saltpetre for gunpowder from neglected sources, etc., etc."

The great armies which the organizing genius of Carnot was putting into the field, had at the beginning lacked officers of the higher ranks. During the first three years of the war three hundred and seventy-three French generals resigned or were cashiered. But now the career open to talents was bringing up from the ranks, or the lower grades, men like Hoche, Jourdan, who had served as a volunteer in the war in America, Kleber, Murat, Bonaparte and others whose abilities were already beginning to appear in victories.

It was therefore at a time when the government was no longer in imminent danger, that the terror plunged into its worst phase. Early in June a law drafted by Robespierre was presented to the Convention, in the name of the Committee of Pubic Safety, by one of his most in-

timate friends. It enlarged the definition of treason until any one might be arrested, dispensed with all defense and made witnesses unnecessary if the court was "sufficiently enlightened" without them. Already the trials had become "mere parodies of justice" and the accusations "odiously lying." [Aulard.] Even the parody now disappeared and the tribunal shovelled batches of men and women into the carts which carried them to the guillotine. In seven weeks thirteen hundred and seventy-six heads fell; more than half of the twenty-six hundred and twenty-seven condemned by the revolutionary tribunal during the sixteen months of its entire activity.

The most outstanding leader of the Montagnards left, Robespierre, was no more responsible for the idea of the terror, nor for its bloody operation as a whole, than many other men. But he was the visible instigator of the last and most horrible phase of its activity and the reaction against its horror was visited on his head. As a member of the Constituent Assembly before the fall of the monarchy, he had done his best to abolish the death penalty. By what dark processes of a fanatic's mind he had come to believe that floods of blood were necessary to establish the gospel according to Rousseau, of whom he was a devoted disciple, we do not know. He was called the incorruptible and he remained poor. How much the subtler bribe of the love of power influenced his devotion to his cause, God could judge, but no man—least of all Robespierre himself.

James Monroe, a devoted admirer of France, the first foreign envoy sent to the new Republic, landed at Havre a few days after Robespierre fell. He wrote to our secretary of state that every one he talked with from Havre to Paris agreed that "Robespierre had become omnipotent . . . and never did a more bloody and merciless tyrant wield the rod of power." He was not omnipotent, but he had enough influence to offend some of his colleagues of

the Committee of Public Safety and his fellow Montagnards of the Convention. A speech which darkly hinted at "cleansing" the Committees and the Convention, added an element of acute fear to dislike. For the fate of Danton, who had saved the Republic, was a warning of what might happen to any one who showed himself a dissenter even in the smallest degree from the political gospel of Robespierre. He was suddenly attacked in the Convention and, amid a tumult which gave him no chance to speak, ordered under arrest, together with four of his fellow-members and his friends, the commander of the national guard of Paris and the president of the revolutionary tribunal. After a vain attempt to raise the sections of Paris in his defense, he went to the guillotine whither he was followed within a week by one hundred and four of the supporters of the exaggerated terror.

The wild ululation of vengeance and joy which went up from the crowded streets as he rode slowly through them in the executioner's cart, was a sign of horror and relief. The Convention closed the Jacobin Clubs, broke up the Commune of Paris and recalled the Girondists. The terror was over.

Albert Gallatin, who had just been (1793) elected Senator from Pennsylvania on the nomination of both parties, expressed the extenuating circumstances which have since been repeatedly pleaded by writers on the terror: "I firmly believe the cause of France to be that of mankind against tyrants. . . . I must confess my soul is not enough steeled not sometimes to shrink at the dreadful executions which have restored tranquillity. Yet, upon the whole, so long as the combined despots press upon every frontier and employ every means to distress the interior, I think they and they alone are responsible for every excess—nay for every crime which either of the contending parties in France may have committed."

Thomas Jefferson, our secretary of state, wrote to our

minister in Holland: "The Jacobins knew France was threatened with the re-establishment of despotism. . . . In the struggle which was necessary many guilty persons fell without the forms of trial and with them some innocent. . . . The liberties of the whole earth were depending on the issue of the contest and was ever such a prize won with so little innocent blood? Were there but an Adam and Eve left in every country and left free—the earth would be better than it is."

In much the same way a member of the English House of Commons speaking against war with France deplored the execution of the King and the other barbarities but said they were chargeable to the "sanguinary proclamation of the Duke of Brunswick" threatening utterly to destroy Paris.

A liberal and learned modern writer (Professor Aulard of the Sorbonne) shows that such extenuation cannot be reasonably applied at all to the last seven weeks of the terror. He says: "When the dictatorship of the Committee of Public Safety evolved into the dictatorship of Robespierre . . . there was a butchery of innocent and guilty, worthy of the rule of the kings, worthy of the inquisition; a slaughter which the state of the national defense leaves absolutely without excuse in the eyes of the historian."

In the psychological problem of how the terror could grow into the savage thing it became, great stress ought perhaps to be laid on that dark tendency of the human spirit labelled intolerance, which has for successive ages led men to believe it their duty to put to death those who differ from them in fundamental ideas. Intolerance has not been confined to devotees of various religions. From the days of the Greeks until now, it has marked a bloody trail across history in the realm of politics. As the heretic and the infidel has been put to death because he might impair human happiness in the next world, so the political

dissident has been killed for opinions which his persecutors thought would destroy human happiness in this world. Probably it is an egotism—akin to insanity, verging toward megalomania,—producing an inward conviction that they are infallible exponents of truth, which has led men, both in religion and in politics, to try to serve mankind by inhumanity. Just before the terror got under way the greatest orator of the Convention, a Girondist, protested against "this political theology which sets up its decisions on all sorts of questions as so many dogmas and threatens the unbeliever with its auto-da-fes." The terror denied every principle of the revolution. "Oh liberty," cried Madame Roland at the scaffold, "what crimes are committed in thy name," and many a heretic has called out of the flames on the name of Christ whose churches put him there.

The terror, especially in its last six months when from twenty to two hundred went to the guillotine every week, was less treacherous, but more cold bloodedly cruel, than the massacre of St. Bartholomew. In both cases the immediate support of the men who planned it was the same; the Paris mob, acting in the sixteenth century out of religious fanaticism and, in the eighteenth century, out of political fanaticism. In both cases, public opinion finally repudiated their action with horror.

CHAPTER XLVI

THE REACTION. GENERAL BONAPARTE DEFENDS THE DIRECTORY. RELIGION REVIVES. WISDOM IN GOVERNMENT

The death of Robespierre unloosed a tremendous reaction. In Paris a song called "The Awakening of the People" replaced for awhile the "Marseillaise." "French people, people of brothers, can you see without a shudder of horror crime displaying the banners of bloodshed and of the Terror?" In some places of the south, the white terror imitated the September massacres and the revolutionary tribunal in savage vengeance for terrible cruelties suffered at the hands of the Jacobins.

A single phenomenon shows light on the suddenness of this change from the terror triumphant to the terror proscribed, and that is the small number taking part in the voting. It has been pointed out that only one voter out of four in all France cast a ballot for the constitution establishing the Republic. In the sections of Paris only one voter out of ten, or in some instances twenty, cast a ballot. The Paris insurrection, therefore, which made the Montagnards master of the Convention and, through the Jacobin societies and the communal governments, masters of France, was the work of a minority resolute and entirely without scruple about anything they considered necessary to maintain a democratic Republic against all enemies within or without.

The Jacobin sections of Paris were not willing to acknowledge defeat and they again invaded with a tumultuous mob the hall of the Convention. A deputy was dragged out into the corridor and shortly after his head put on a pike was paraded in front of the desk of the

President, who gravely saluted it. Two days later twenty thousand men had rallied to the Convention, and marched upon the most active of the handworkers' quarters, the Faubourg St. Antoine. It surrendered and gave up its arms. Thousands were arrested and thirty-six executed by court martial. The Montagnard party was destroyed and the Jacobin clubs were suppressed.

The changed Convention, freed from constraint, appointed a committee composed almost entirely of ancient Girondists to make a new constitution. For the terror had disgusted them and all France with democracy and they wanted another constitution which kept the control of government in the hands of property owners. This was very effectively done. True, the suffrage was given to all who paid taxes; which only cut off one sixth of the voters under the former republican constitution. But the candidates were chosen, not directly, but by electors, as it was originally intended that our presidents should be. These electors must own or rent property worth the wages of from one to two hundred days of work. This put the control of the Republic into the hands of well to do people, for there were in France only 20,000 qualified to be electors. In doing this they were influenced not only by their unfortunate experience of the rule of the violent but also by the example of America.

The seven hundred and fifty national representatives were to be divided into the Council of the Elders and the Council of Five Hundred. This also was an imitation, as the secretary of the committee said in his report, of "our older brother in the career of liberty the American people." The executive power was to be in the hands of a Directory of five, elected one each year by the Councils. In addition, only one third of the assembly could be newly elected. Five hundred deputies were to keep their seats while two hundred and fifty seats were vacated each year.

Against this provision (the so called two-thirds) the sections of Paris which had remained quiet during the Jacobin insurrections, the well to do sections, mustered their national guards (about 25,000 men) to march on the Convention. The Convention also mustered troops under the lead of one of their members of some military experience. He had been impressed, while on mission to the south, with a general of artillery, twenty-five years old, named Napoleon Bonaparte. This young man was in Paris on the retired list of the army: for he had been suspected and even ordered under arrest because of his intimacy with the younger brother of Robespierre. He was appointed one of the generals to defend the Convention and immediately dispatched cavalry to bring in forty field guns from the nearest army camp. He handled them so skilfully, that the attackers were defeated with heavy loss. He had perhaps prevented the fall of the Republic and the restoration of the monarchy by the first decisive intervention of the regular army in civil conflicts. Two weeks later he was made commander-in-chief of the army of the interior.

The Republic had created a great army to defend herself against Kings. That army under the lead of its ablest general was now to control France—with the consent of a large part of the French people.

One of the most striking things that followed the fall of Jacobinism and the reaction against the terror, was the spontaneous restoration of the Catholic Church as an important and open factor in the social situation. Hébert, the violent Jacobin, had tried, not long before Robespierre sent him to the guillotine, to introduce by a great spectacle in Notre Dame, partly staged by the ballet girls of the opera, a worship of reason based on atheism. Robespierre had led the Convention to vote that "the French people recognizes the existence of God and the immortality of the soul and considers atheism bound up

with conspiracy against the Republic." On this basis he launched a new religion by a great festival in the gardens of the Tuileries where the figures of atheism, ambition and discord were burnt together. In his religion patriotism became righteousness and the spread of democratic republicanism to all nations was the coming kingdom of God on earth. The ancient Church of France, oppressed in the interest of this new civic religion, had in many places disappeared. But as soon as the Convention declared that, in conformity to the rights of man, religion, though separated entirely from the Republic was entirely free, there was "an instantaneous and universal religious revival" which proved that "it was impossible to suppress the Catholic religion in France." The religious buildings were given back to those who wished to use them and within sixteen months thirty-two thousand parishes were worshipping regularly in their ancient churches and more than four thousand other communes had applied for the same privilege.

Amid the strain and the horrors of the struggle of the revolutionary committees to defend the right of France to manage her own affairs, and the effort to enforce by sword and guillotine a particular type of political doctrine as the only possible basis for worthy human society, there were in the convention men who did not forget the civilizing genius of the French people.

The *École Normale* was founded, less to teach the sciences than the art of teaching them. The students, who must be at least twenty-one years of age, came from all parts of France; one for each twenty thousand inhabitants, about thirteen hundred in all. Fourteen of the leading scholars in France lectured to them, each on the best method of teaching his special subject. The pupils after four months' instruction were supposed to establish secondary normal schools in their own districts. The École Normale still exists in a changed form as one

of the most distinguished institutions for graduate study in the world.

During the terror, Jacobin sympathizers had in many parts of France, inflicted great damage on works of art, while obliterating signs of royalty and feudalism. This vandalism was sternly condemned by the Convention and they founded the Archæological Museum; an institution which has contributed much to the rehabilitation of mediæval art in France.

On the report of a committee, the Conservatory of Music was founded. The Convention also established—to teach Arabian, Persian and other Eastern tongues—the school of Living Oriental Languages, which now teaches twenty-seven tongues of Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe.

National education was organized, leading up from elementary schools managed by the local administrations, through intermediary higher schools, to schools of astronomy, geometry and mechanics, natural history, medicine, the veterinary art, archæology, political science, the arts and music.

In the very midst of the strife between Montagnards and Girondists the Convention had lengthened copyright in books to ten years after the death of the writer. It reformed the calendar and its committee worked out that metric system of weights and measures which has since been adopted by most of the nations of Europe and America. One of the members of the committee was Pierre Laplace. On the hundredth anniversary of his death an editorial in the *New York Times* said: "The gift of fitting seemingly unrelated facts into a beautifully ordered whole marks the scientist of genius. There are scarcely a dozen such synthesizers in the history of the human race. Laplace was one of them. In a broad sense modern mathematical physics and therefore that system of thinking which links stars and atoms, began with him."

At its last sitting, the Convention voted to issue a general amnesty and to change the name of the Place de la Revolution where the guillotine had stood, to Place de la Concorde.

Even while the terror was in full control, a French physician began to lead a great advance in the direction of humane treatment of what had long been, perhaps, the most miserable class of human beings. In those days, more or less all over Europe and America, the insane were commonly starved and often flogged, usually chained or tied with rope, "in filthy surroundings with beds of straw seldom renewed or with no beds at all except the cold stone floors." Philippe Pinel was appointed during the height of the terror chief doctor of two great asylum-hospitals at Paris. He wakened the conscience of men to inveterate barbaric custom, demonstrated that much mental disease is curable by skill and kindness and pointed out the road followed by others like our own Dorothea Dix. His book on the classification of diseases won instant recognition throughout Europe and was immediately translated into various languages. His life-sized statue in the courtyard of a great asylum at Barcelona expresses the admiration of men of another nation for a Frenchman who was one of the leaders of the world toward freedom from cruelty and ignorance.

CHAPTER XLVII

THE DIRECTORY. ITS OVERTHROW BY BONAPARTE AND HIS FRIENDS

The new Directory which took power October 1795 had no dangers to the Republic to face like those which had confronted the Committee of Safety. A summary report spoke of victory in "eight pitched battles, 116 towns and 230 forts taken, 90,000 prisoners and 3800 cannon captured." Civil wars indeed persisted in four places, but they were flickering flames whose only connection with each other was the money England secretly sent to them.

Four of the five first directors were honest men of the middle class with a strong sense of duty. The fifth was lazy, debauched, greedy for money and not too scrupulous where he got it. Corruptionists, bribe takers and all other creatures of that type gathered around. When the Tuileries was stormed, the mob shot thieves and, during the terror, scores of profiteers in misery went to the scaffold. But now others, who were discreet, followed with impunity evil example and created the unjust suspicion that the whole Directory was corrupt.

During the maritime struggle between France and England, before the Directory was established, America became involved in warm disputes with Great Britain over the freedom of the seas and violations of the rights of neutral ships. "A word from Washington and the nation would have cheerfully plunged into war with England." [Channing.]

A little later the government of the United States became involved in discussion of a similar sort with the French Foreign Office. A treaty made twenty years before created a mutual defensive alliance which bound the

United States to help France defend her West Indian Islands. Washington asked his Cabinet whether that treaty applied to the war between France and England. The Secretary of the Treasury (Hamilton) and the Secretary of War said it did not because of the revolution and because the war, although threatened by England, had been begun by France. The Secretary of State (Jefferson) and the Attorney General thought that "the obligations created by the treaty remained the same. There was nothing in the alteration of government or in the character of the war, which could impair the right of France to demand, or weaken the duty of the United States faithfully to comply with the engagements which had been solemnly formed."

The people shared the opinion of Jefferson. The feeling was all but universal—men of all parties shared it——that it was almost criminal to remain unconcerned spectators of a conflict between their ancient enemy and republican France. The few who did not embrace these opinions—and they were certainly very few—were held up to public detestation as "satellites of despotism." [Marshall.] Washington, though extremely averse to war, seems to have shared the opinion that the treaty was binding.

Fortunately for his embarrassment, the French minister Genet when presented to Washington gave "the most explicit assurances that, because of the distance of the United States and of other circumstances, France did not wish to engage the United States in the war. " 'We know,' he said, 'that we have the right to call upon you for the guaranty of our islands but we do not desire it.' " [Marshall and Jefferson]. He claimed however that an article of the treaty of commerce expressly authorized France to arm privateers in American ports and closed them against all other nations. He was an explosive personality with an exaggerated idea of his own influence

and a colossal lack of tact. He tried to appeal to the people over the head of Washington, who asked his recall. The French Foreign Minister, in recalling him wrote: of his "punishable" conduct which was "foreign to his instructions" and had excited at the French Foreign Office "the highest indignation." Genet, fearing the guillotine, got Washington's permission to stay in the United States. He married a daughter of Governor Clinton of New York and died a prosperous American citizen.

In spite of this attitude, France and the United States, on a renewal five years later of the discussion over the freedom of the sea, drifted during more than a year into what would now be acts of war. Letters of marque were issued by the government of the United States authorizing American privateers to prey on French commerce as French privateers had attacked American vessels. A French frigate was seized in the West Indian Islands by an American man of war. This trouble with England and France was an early illustration of the fact that, it is very difficult for the United States to keep out of any general wide-spread European war. The President who was re-elected on the slogan "He kept us out of war" asked Congress, seventeen months later, to declare that a state of war existed.

Although the problem of defense which confronted the new government was not too difficult, the financial problem seemed insoluble. The *assignats* had been issued at first as 5% mortgage bonds, based on the national lands. They were only good for the purchase of lands and they were to be destroyed as fast as they were paid in. But the interest paying feature was given up, *assignats* were made general legal tender and enormous quantities were printed. In 1790 it was decreed that 1,200,000,000 was to be the limit. Six years later there were 45,000,000,000. Even when more than half these were retired,

assignats were still worth only 30 to 1. At this price they were made exchangeable for land warrants, which at once began to go down and were finally accepted by the State at 1/70 of their face value in real money. The ruin of the national finances inherited from Louis XIV and enhanced by inflation, finally brought bankruptcy.

That the government of the Directory, clumsily made and feeble, bankrupt and unable to assure a practical union of liberty and order, continued without serious trouble for two years, was due to the success of their armies. The troops of the Republic were still inspired by the idea that they were fighting, not only for the safety of France, but for the liberty of the world and they were led by generals who added to the daring of youth, the skill of experience.

Among these was Napoleon Bonaparte who, because of his services in defending the Republican government against the royalist reaction of some of the well-to-do quarters of Paris, was sent to Italy at the age of twenty-seven as commander in chief of the army against Austria. At the end of twenty months he came back, after having conquered and republicanized a large part of Italy, forced peace upon Austria and become immensely popular in France.

During these achievements he began to display three of the qualities which made his career; military genius joined to courage that won his soldiers' hearts till they nicknamed him the "little corporal," great skill in managing publicity and the capacity to say to his soldiers and to his people exactly what they wanted to hear: a capacity in which he has been matched in modern times only by Mussolini. The printing press was as necessary to his campaigns as his field batteries.

For example, two months after he entered Italy, proclamations thus addressed his "brothers in arms." "Soldiers! You have rushed like a torrent from the tops of

the Apennines; you have overthrown, dispersed, scattered all that opposed your march. . . . The Po, the Tessin, the Adda were not able to delay you a single day on their banks; the boasted defences of Italy have been insufficient, you have crossed them as quickly as the Apennines. . . . Yes, soldiers, you have done a great deal, but is nothing more left for you to do? Let us push on! We have still forced marches to make, enemies to subdue, laurels to gather, insults to avenge. . . . But let the peoples we are invading be without anxiety; we are friends of all peoples! . . . You will have the immortal glory of changing the face of the most beautiful part of Europe. The French people free, respected by the whole world, will give Europe a glorious peace which will repay them for the sacrifices of every kind they have made for the last six years. Then you will go home and your fellow citizens will say, pointing to you: "He was of the army of Italy."

In Italy, Napoleon not only made war, he made peace and he no more waited for orders from home in his diplomacy than he did in his daring tactics. His example was contagious, other generals and officers of state began to act on their own responsibility and, outside of the army, "nobody obeyed anybody else." The central government lost the respect of the army which came to look on it as a lot of squabbling politicians. Therefore when Napoleon came to Paris in December 1797 all France admired the man who had won 18 pitched battles, taken 150,000 prisoners, set up Republican institutions among the people of a large part of Italy and enriched the art museums of Paris with the finest statues, pictures and manuscripts—trophies of victory. For the habit of artistic plunder, imitating the Roman conquerors of Greece, begun when the French armies entered Belgium as bringers of liberty, was not abandoned by the liberators who set up south of the Alps the Cisalpine, the Ligurian

and the Parthenopean Republics. The great chemist Berthollet was the head of a commission to select in Italy the best pictures, statues and manuscripts for the museums and libraries of Paris.

The Directory was afraid of this young general; two years ago poor and unknown but now back from Italy very rich and a popular hero. They were anxious to have him out of the way and finally assented to his plan to attack Egypt as a means of destroying English eastern commerce. In May 1798 he led an expedition to the eastern Mediterranean consisting of thirty-two of the best generals, 38,000 troops, thirteen ships of the line and three hundred and twenty other vessels manned by 10,000 seamen. He also took with him a number of civilians, scientists, literary men and artists, to investigate the history, art and archæology of the East. He easily defeated the Turkish mamelukes, took Cairo and Alexandria and invaded Syria. His connections with France were however cut by Nelson, who destroyed, in the battle of the Nile, most of the French vessels of war.

Meantime the conduct of the Directory, in dethroning kings and setting up republics, had alarmed the chief dynasties of Europe and in March 1799 a coalition had been formed against France, consisting of England, Austria, Russia, a part of Germany, Naples, Portugal and Turkey. The government ordered the conscription for military service of all men between 20 and 25, divided into five armies. The victory of General Brune over fifty thousand Russians landed by English ships in Holland and of General Masséna over a large force of Russians at Zurich, saved France from invasion and caused the withdrawal of Russia from the coalition. But Italy was lost to France and occupied by the Austrians.

The Directory had now fallen into great disrepute. It had not only failed to do what imperatively needed to be done—to stabilize the government, it had made evident

the faults of its construction by internecine strife. This had produced three of those movements which the French call a *coup d'etat,* transfers of power from one set of men to another by the use of force thinly veiled under a pretense of legality.

Three of the Directors, acting in accordance with advice sent them from Italy by Bonaparte, had quietly massed 12,000 troops in Paris. The Tuileries was surrounded and 198 deputies deprived of their seats—forty of them had their property confiscated and were banished. The defense of this violence was the assertion of a plot backed by England to restore the monarchy. Within seven months a similar purging of the lists was needed to maintain a government majority. A year later, however, the elections enabled the assemblies to attack the Directorate and even threaten three of them with the guillotine.

A few months after this last *coup d'etat,* Napoleon slipped by the English cruisers in the Mediterranean and landed in France. In this situation, with the Republic threatened by invasion, a feeble government apparently hesitating between a reaction toward royalism or toward the terror of the old Jacobins, the capable young general, whose banners were always followed by victory —seemed the destined saviour of France. On his journey from the Mediterranean coast to Paris, the roads were frequently blocked by applauding crowds.

Three weeks after his return to Paris, Napoleon, backed by practically all the generals in or near the city, mobilized 7,000 men and marched to the Tuileries. Under pretence of a Jacobin plot, the sittings of the Councils were transferred to a palace on the outskirts of Paris. Napoleon followed with his small army and the palace was completely surrounded. Leaving an escort of soldiers at the door, he entered the Council of the Elders and demanded their orders to save liberty. When some

called out "How about the Constitution?" he answered, "You have broken it three times. No one respects it."

When he went to the Assembly of the Five Hundred, he had a stormy time. Cries arose "Down with the Dictator"—"Outlaw Bonaparte." Confused and uncertain, he withdrew, evidently seized by one of those attacks which sometimes came upon him at times of great nervous strain. When he tried to mount his horse to address the soldiers, he fell to the ground. But his brother Lucien, deputy from Corsica and President of the Five Hundred that day, had refused to put questions, resigned his functions and followed his brother from the hall. He told the troops the blatant falsehood that the majority of the assembly was terrorized by members armed with daggers and doubtless bribed by English gold. Under the command of two brothers-in-law of Napoleon, Generals Murat and Leclerc, a detachment of grenadiers, drums beating, cleared the hall. When some deputies refused to go, the soldiers laughed, picked them up and carried them out.

At night twenty-five or thirty deputies met, with Lucien Bonaparte presiding, and declared that the Directory no longer existed, that sixty-one members of the councils should lose their seats and that the legislative body should adjourn for fifteen weeks, leaving the executive power in the hands of three consuls of whom General Bonaparte was one. Under his influence a new constitution was drawn up which named him First Consul. Universal suffrage for all men of twenty-five who were not domestic servants, was established. But there was nothing of importance for them to vote about. Of the three assemblies, none were elected by the people. The power of the purse and the control of legislation were in the hands of the executive. "Practically there was no legal barrier to Napoleon's will." [Aulard.] This arbitrary constitution was submitted to popular vote after it had been put in

force. This may partly account for the vote of 3,011,007 yeas to 1562 nays.

When by this overwhelming majority the French people "abdicated its sovereignty to place it in the hands of one man," the Republicans, who included the whole army, simply regarded the confiding of power to this skilful general as a form of the entirely Republican expedient of a dictatorship. The great mass of the nation were weary of the feebleness, the fanaticism, the corruption or the inefficiency which the revolutionary government had shown at one time or another during seven years. They went back with a sigh of relief to the government of their fathers; government by one man. Only it was government by one man who had gained power not by inheritance but by ability. In this successful soldier and organizer they saw the Republic glorified and incarnate, as their forefathers had seen the Monarchy glorified and incarnate in Louis XIV.

CHAPTER XLVIII

NAPOLEON

Napoleon Bonaparte was born of a family of Florentine origin which had lived in Corsica for nearly three hundred years. Although he acquired supreme skill in appealing to the people of France, there are students of his character who deny that he ever became a typical Frenchman. Certain it is that the grandiose dreams which engaged his imagination from an early age, were not French plans but world plans. Those he admired among the rulers of men were not great French kings like St. Louis or Henry IV, but Alexander, who built a vast Empire in Asia, or Charlemagne, who swayed Europe by the sword when the passion of patriotism did not exist.

True, Napoleon became for a time the armed champion of democracy, who shook the dry bones of European politics and society and did great things both in war and peace. But he finally seduced France from the love of the civic virtues and liberty to the love of military glory; that strange passion, known to all peoples and in all ages, which finds an unreasonable gratification to personal pride in the feeling that a man's own tribe or nation has such superiority in the art of organized killing as enables it to humiliate or oppress other tribes or nations.

His administration of France was at first "rapid, simple and equitable. It was only gradually that it became brutal and tyrannical, as the master himself degenerated from a good into an evil despot." Towards the end he "based on slavery" an empire which "can be called, perhaps without exaggeration, a tyranny as insane as it was grandiose." [Aulard.]

While he was still in his cradle, Corsica was incorporated into France by cession from Genoa, endorsed by conquest and also by the consent of some of its inhabitants. His father put him in French schools where he spent a poor and laborious youth, reading widely in history and politics. He often ate only bread to save money to buy books and to the end of his career he carried a small library with him even on campaign. His favourite books were Plutarch's *Lives* and Cæsar's *Commentaries.*

After a scholastic course good without being at all distinguished, he passed his qualifying examination for the artillery. At the age of twenty-six, his prospects in his chosen profession were not brilliant. He had the title of general, not hard to get in those days, but he lacked influential friends and was suspected of Jacobin sympathies by the moderate republicans who then controlled the Directory.

So small seemed his chance of making a career in France that he asked permission to go to Turkey to train the artillery of the Sultan's army. The accident of his presence at Paris and the fact that the member of the Convention who was charged with its defense knew him, set his foot on the lowest rung of the ladder and he rose rapidly by his transcendent military abilities, his courage, his self reliance, the sweeping appeal of his proclamations and his skill in keeping himself before the eyes of men. He came back from his brilliant victories in Italy at the age of twenty-eight, the most conspicuous of the French generals. He fled from Egypt leaving his victorious army caged in its useless conquest, by the English fleet and was hailed as the long expected saviour of the nation.

Five weeks after Napoleon made himself, with the help of his generals and his brother, master of France, Washington died. The new chief ruler, in an order of the day addressed to all the armies of the Republic, wrote: "Wash-

ington is dead. That great man fought against tyranny. He established on a firm basis the liberties of his country. His memory will always be dear to the French people and to all free men of both worlds. Therefore the First Consul orders that for ten days all the flags of the Republic shall be draped in black." But although he praised Washington, Napoleon had no intention of imitating him. On the contrary, in four years he was Emperor of France under a constitution which made him as absolute as Louis XIV and, in three years more, his power gained by conquest beyond the borders of France, threatened to make him dictator of Europe and arbiter of the world.

Two bold steps, each implying usurpation, put him in control of France. In 1802 when a usually subservient senate refused to change his title from Consul for ten years to Consul for life, Napoleon, after consultation with the council of state, but without any constitutional right, called for a vote of the people on the question "Shall Napoleon Bonaparte be First Consul for life?" The result was 3,577,259 ayes to 8,374 noes. Two years later with an even smaller number of noes, a popular vote confirmed the action of the Senate proclaiming him Emperor of the French.

During these four years he won the victory of Marengo which made France instead of Austria dominant in Italy. He used that dominance to rearrange northern Italy into republics; for one of which he was elected President, while for the other he named the Doge. A good number of Italians at this time thought Napoleon, whose mother tongue was Italian, belonged to them as much as to France. In these four years, during which he gave France fourteen months of the first complete peace she had enjoyed for ten years, he showed also abilities as an administrator which matched "his prodigious genius as a captain superior to all others." [Foch.]

The only field of government in which Napoleon did not achieve success was colonization. The present names of flourishing cities indicate the extent to which the French had spread military and trading posts through the valley of the Mississippi during the eighteenth century. Baton Rouge, Detroit, Des Moines, Dubuque, St. Louis, New Orleans, Vincennes, etc. To the whole of this vast and ill defined territory of 1,000,000 square miles, out of which have been formed nine states and the greater part of four more, the French had given the name of Louisiana. They made feeble efforts to colonize it and, in 1762, ceded it to their ally Spain to make up for her losses to England by the Seven Years' War.

In 1800 Napoleon got this vast territory back in exchange for the promise of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany and the title of a king for the son-in-law of the King of Spain. He also agreed not to sell it to anybody but Spain. He apparently had the idea of developing a colonial Empire and began it by an attempt to recover Saint Domingue, the prosperity of whose settlers had been destroyed by a negro insurrection which had killed a large part of the whites. He ordered the re-establishment of slavery, but he lost 24,000 men by fever in three months and his brother-in-law, General Leclerc, reported that the subjugation of the island under the regime of slavery would require heavy reinforcements and the slaughter of half the lower classes, men, women and children over twelve years of age. Napoleon withdrew his army.

Discouraged by this disaster, absorbed by new European wars and realizing that Louisiana could be of little value since he could not defend the mouth of the Mississippi against the British fleet, Napoleon suddenly offered to sell Louisiana to the United States for 60,000,000 francs and the assumption by us of 20,000,000 francs worth of claims against France by our citizens. This increased the territory of the United States by nearly

150% and gave us, for about four cents an acre, 640,000,000 acres including the largest extent of highly fertile land in the world. It was an even better bargain than the enormously profitable purchase of Alaska from Russia for $7,000,000.

With the exception of the failure of this ill considered scheme of colonization the civil administration of Napoleon was extremely efficient.

He balanced for the first time in a century the budget of France. He made peace with the Church in a *concordat* which acknowledged that "the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion was the religion of the great majority of French citizens." The First Consul named the bishops and the Pope canonically instituted them. They appointed the parish priests from candidates approved by the state. Bishops and priests took an oath of obedience and fidelity to the government and the government paid their salaries. The small Calvinist and Lutheran churches in France were allowed to exist on similar terms. Although Napoleon was not a religious man, he believed religion necessary to the maintenance of government. The Pope, in Notre Dame, after anointing him with holy oil, blessed the crown which the Emperor placed on his own head. Under the Empire the Church of Rome was gradually restored to its old position as the state church and its catechism taught obedience to the Emperor as one of the prime duties of Christians.

The day after the celebration of the signing of the *concordat,* a committee reported a project for the reform of education. This established secondary schools, or *lycées,* with a curriculum based on Latin and mathematics. The pupils wore uniforms, were instructed by a retired military officer and all changes of classes were made by beat of drum. Napoleon finally created a single university for all France, with a grand master at its head who was helped by a staff of nearly 100 functionaries.

The bases of instruction were to be "the precepts of the Christian religion and fidelity to the Napoleonic dynasty as the conserver of the happiness of nations and the unity of France." The University, through the rectors of the academies (the sixteen local universities with the schools of their districts) managed with the help of inspectors and directors, the entire state system of instruction. For primary instruction the Napoleonic University did nothing. It was left for each locality in the hands of the mayors and councils—and it was the only thing of importance that was left in their hands. They appointed the teacher, furnished him a lodging and decided how much the parents of his scholars were to pay for his salary.

Napoleon changed the entire local administration. It passed entirely out of the hands of the different localities into the hands of the central government. The *prefets, sous prefets* and mayors managed all weighty affairs and they were appointed by the Emperor. He chose able men of political experience whose administration was efficient. In spite of modifications of succeeding years, the surviving influence of the Napoleonic system of local administration still imposes on France a degree of centralization, which many intelligent Frenchmen consider an obstacle to the best efficiency of the Republic.

One of the most noteworthy of Napoleon's civil achievements was finishing the legal code. He appointed five commissions and pushed the work with all his energy; frequently presiding over the sessions and taking an active part in the discussions. Three months after his coronation the result was established as the civil code of the French. The clearness of its language and the skill with which its analysis is presented, have given it a very wide influence and it has served, to a greater or smaller degree, as a model for the codes of most of the countries of Europe and Latin America.

Napoleon as Consul surrounded France with buffer states in the shape of allied Republics, the Ligurian and Cisalpine Republics in Italy, the Helvetic (Swiss) Republic in the east and the Batavian (Dutch) Republic on the north. Six months after his coronation as Emperor, he put on his own head the crown of Italy and the next year he changed Holland into a kingdom and persuaded his reluctant brother Louis to accept its crown. Four years later Louis, unwilling to betray his people longer to the merciless exploitation of his older brother, fled from his kingdom and Holland was annexed to France. Such arbitrary acts as these, exploiting without scruple each successive settlement by peace—constantly reawakened the fear of the European powers and became a leading influence in the formation of six European coalitions against Napoleon.

His military genius, however, seemed for a time to raise him above all danger and, three years after his coronation, having beaten the Austrians, Russians and Prussians at Ulm, Austerlitz, Jena, Eylau and Friedland, battles which "showed the art of war raised above all known heights" [Foch] he seemed to be the dictator of Europe. He was Emperor of France, King of Italy and Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, which stretched from the allied Helvetic Republic to the North and Baltic seas. One of his brothers was King of Naples and Sicily, another was King of Holland, his two sisters had duchies in Italy, his brother-in-law was Grand Duke of Berg and, in addition, he had reserved eighteen duchies in Italy to be distributed to his marshals and the great officials of the Empire, who were to draw a large part of the public revenues of these states. The veterans of his army were devoted to him because he invariably gave them what the soldier loves best—victory. To further stimulate this devotion he reserved for his soldiers, 84,000,000 francs worth of national domain in Italy, Poland and Hanover

and 7,500,000 of rent in Prussia and Italy. He cut Prussia in half to form a new kingdom for his brother Jerome and a Grand Duchy for his ally the King of Saxony.

There were only two great powers he had not decisively defeated; England who had driven his fleets from the sea and Russia whom he had beaten outside her own boundaries but never invaded. It was the attempt to subdue these two adversaries which brought his downfall.

He proposed to close all the ports of Europe to English ships by a "continental blockade" and so ruin her. The blockade was more difficult to enforce than the Volstead act and a huge system of organized smuggling came into being which spread to France itself. In the end the blockade was perhaps to England's commercial advantage and the attempt to enforce it on all Europe led him "with a France exhausted in every way, to try the impossible." Portugal was open to English trade and so a French army drove the royal family to Brazil and Napoleon proposed to dismember Portugal and annex it to Spain. The degenerate King of Spain handed over his crown for a large estate in France with an income of 7,500,000 francs and Napoleon made his brother Joseph Bonaparte, King of the Iberian Peninsula (May 1808). The Spanish people refused to ratify the bargain and rose in a desperate revolt. Napoleon himself said of this "Spanish affair": "I confess the immorality of it was too patent —the injustice too cynical." The English, who had previously fought only at sea and by subsidies, landed an army at Lisbon and, during five years, Spain swallowed up thousands of Napoleon's best troops.

Napoleon's last and fatal quarrel with Russia was brought to the breaking point by the refusal of the Czar to enter supinely into the continental blockade and to shut neutral ships, especially American ships, entirely from his ports. Napoleon raised a huge army, of which more than two-thirds did not speak French and, in the spring

of 1812, marched to Moscow. But the Russians burnt the city and Napoleon was forced to make, across the frozen plains, the most terrible retreat in history. Men dropped by thousands, frozen, starved, wounded, as pursuing and pursued fought like great wolf packs in the deadly cold. Only fragments of his huge army escaped.

All Europe rose against him in the sixth coalition, animated not simply by dynastic politics, but by the patriotism of peoples, like the Prussians or the Spaniards, whose liberty he had trampled under foot. He raised a new army whose ranks were filled with Frenchmen, many of them boys. But he was beaten in the three days battle of Leipzig (Oct. 1813) and only a fifth of his army got back to France. Even then he refused an offer of peace which would have left him Emperor of a France bounded by the Rhine, the Alps and the Pyrenees. The allies poured into France from all sides and, in spite of the military genius of Napoleon, which never shone brighter than in this desperate defense against impossible odds, Paris was taken. His marshals refused to carry on the hopeless struggle any longer, Napoleon abdicated April 1814 and a brother of Louis XVI was proclaimed King of France.

Napoleon was given a subsidy and the government of the island of Elba off the Italian coast. Eleven months later he landed with a thousand men in France and soon found himself at the head of his old army. He ruled for a hundred days until his army was routed at Waterloo by Wellington commanding the Belgians and English and Blücher commanding the Prussians. Everybody fell away from him except his brother Lucien, who had saved him from failure in the first *coup d'etat.* "What," Lucien exclaimed in the Chamber of Deputies: "the powers of Europe are invading France and France is advised to abandon her Emperor!" Lafayette answered, "France followed him into the sands of Egypt and the snows of

Russia, and, because she followed him, she mourns the blood of 3,000,000 Frenchmen."

In June 1815 the Emperor signed his second abdication and fled to a seaport, intending to sail to the United States. When his way was blocked, he surrendered on board a British man of war. England, with the approval of the other powers who still feared him, sent him to the remote island of St. Helena, where he passed the remaining six years of his life.

Marshal Foch, the best expounder of the military genius of Napoleon, has said this about his career: "He wanted to regulate the fate of nations by arms, . . . as if his people could live by glory and not by work. As if the beaten nations, their independence attacked, would not certainly rise some day to reconquer it with armies invincible in the ardour given them by outraged right; as if, in a civilized world, morality would not prove its case against a power resting only on force. . . . Napoleon fell because above the armies to be led victoriously there is justice—because above war there is peace. . . . Even the most gifted man goes astray . . . when he puts himself apart from the moral law of human societies made up of respect for the individual and of those principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, which are the bases of our civilization as Christianity has made it."

CHAPTER XLIX

THE RE-ESTABLISHED KINGS AND THE TWO REVOLUTIONS THEY PROVOKED. FRANCE THE TORCH-BEARER FOR LIBERAL EUROPE

Louis XVIII was made King as the heir of his brother Louis XVI for lack of anything better to do. There was no enthusiasm for him, but the allies were not simply trying to force a hated monarch upon a conquered people. They wanted an established government with which to make peace and they wanted one strong enough to maintain order and reactionary enough to prevent any further attempt to disseminate revolutionary democratic propaganda.

In spite of earlier suggestions, the allies compelled the abandonment of all the conquests of the Republic and the Empire, including fifty-four fortresses and ten thousand cannon. But they demanded no war indemnity, and gave up claims to full payment for the enormous requisitions of the armies of Napoleon. The government of Louis XVIII collapsed at Napoleon's return and Louis XVIII fled. When the Empire of Napoleon collapsed in its turn after Waterloo, the invaders imposed more severe terms upon the restored Monarchy. The Netherlands demanded the annexation of French territory on its southern borders, Prussia demanded Alsace and Lorraine. The jealousy of Austria blocked this demand, but the allies finally imposed 700,000,000 francs of war indemnity and five years of military occupation at the expense of France.

Louis XVIII had considerable native intelligence, though his laziness had limited its development. He was clever enough to recognize that a full restoration of the ancient absolute monarchy was impossible. He therefore appointed a commission of nine senators, nine deputies

and four royal ministers, to draw up a charter, which affirmed equality before the law, liberty of the person, of the press and of worship, irremovable judges and trial by jury. The new government was, generally speaking, modelled on the English government, with a house of peers, appointed or hereditary, and an elected chamber of deputies which voted taxes for one year. The king initiated legislation and his ministers were responsible. The suffrage was, like the English suffrage, very much restricted by a property qualification. Six years after the re-establishment of the throne, there were 29,000,000 inhabitants in France of whom 10,085,000 were tax payers. Of these only 96,525, or one in a hundred, could vote, only 18,500 or one in about five hundred and fifty, could be elected. In addition, from one third to one half of the electors usually kept away from the polls. It was a government with a narrow base, intended to be constitutional and moderately liberal, and resting on the more well-to-do citizens of the middle class.

Louis XVIII reigned for some years according to this charter, and such trouble as he had came from militant monarchists who wished to be more royalist than the King. Two years before his death, however, probably because he was fatigued and bored by the details of administration, he began to allow his brother and heir great influence in government. The heir to the throne was a believer in absolutism and the divine right of kings—a typical reactionary who had forgotten nothing and learned nothing. There rallied round him all those who were willing to set aside the charter until they could annul it. By manipulating the elections in various ways, the ministry got a heavy reactionary majority in the Chamber, made up of people like that lawyer member who spoke of the "absurd and antisocial dogma of the sovereignty of the people."

There was, however, a strong, though not large liberal

opposition; among whom the most distinguished figure was Lafayette. He never lacked the courage of his convictions and he uttered a solemn warning that the rights recognized by the charter were now in peril: "The counter revolution," he continued, "is in control of the government. . . . My friends and I have felt obliged to declare this to the nation and loyally to give warning of it to those who have violated their sworn word of honour." A secret association to defend liberty spread rapidly over France, some of whose members wanted an empire again and others a republic with Lafayette for president. It was mainly composed of young men but Lafayette and a group of his colleagues were members.

The death of Louis XVIII in 1824 made his reactionary brother king under the title of Charles X. His first speech from the throne did not even mention the charter. He disbanded the national guard, and tried to keep in office a ministry not in accord with the majority of the Chamber of Deputies. These, and similar things, so aroused the one hundred thousand electors of France that, they finally returned a Chamber with a liberal majority of nearly two thirds.

The King had already ignored the charter. He now issued four royal ordinances which virtually suspended it. He intended a *coup d'etat,* under forms of law, but in July, 1830, six years after his accession, Paris gave him a revolution.

The destruction by the police of the presses of liberal journals raised the barricades. The royal general had eighteen thousand troops in and near Paris, but the three columns which he sent in to attack the insurrection had stones and musket balls rained on them from the windows, and the barricades they cleared by bayonet and cannon, were rebuilt behind them as they marched on. It was the old Paris which had taken the Bastille and stormed the Louvre. The royal general pushed one column to the

centre of the city, but two others were checked. He lost twenty-five hundred men and the entire eastern half of Paris remained in the hands of the insurgents. The next day two regiments went over to the rebels, and the royal army retreated.

From the beginning Lafayette openly avowed that his name was placed "by the confidence of the people and with his full consent, at the head of the insurrection." This was to face the guillotine in case of failure, but a little later he could declare at the city hall, surrounded by armed and victorious crowds that "the royal family had ceased to reign." The question was what should replace it? The armed crowds, led for the most part by students and artisans, shouted for the Republic. The liberals of the Chamber of Deputies wanted a really constitutional monarchy under the Duke of Orleans, who was a descendant of a brother of Louis XIV. In his early twenties the Duke had spent several years travelling in the United States. He always professed the liberal opinions of his father, who, under the name of Philip Equality, represented Paris in the Revolutionary Convention, voted for the death of the King and was sent to the guillotine during the terror.

The decision between a republic and a constitutional monarchy seems to have rested with Lafayette, who, at the age of seventy-two, was playing a conspicuous part in his third revolution. When he presented himself at a window of the city hall with the Duke of Orleans, both enveloped, not in the white flag of the reigning King, but in the folds of the old tricolour of the Republic, it was well said that the "republican embrace of Lafayette made a king." Although he personally preferred a republic, he refused to allow his friends to propose him as president, because he believed "a constitutional monarchy suited France better." He explained his position to the Duke: "What is needed is a popular throne, surrounded by institutions which are republican—entirely republi-

can. That is my understanding of the situation. You know that I am a Republican and that I regard the constitution of the United States as the most perfect which has ever existed. I think as you do. It is impossible for any man to spend two years in America and not share that opinion."

When Charles X, from his refuge outside Paris, insisted upon the recognition of his grandson, Lafayette, as commander of the re-established national guard, ordered the drummers to beat the assembly through the streets and, at the head of six thousand militia and fifteen or twenty thousand armed citizens, started a new version of the old march on Versailles. Before the column reached the royal château, Charles X left it on his flight to England.

In every way the new monarchy broke with the Bourbon past. Its banner was not the white of the sons of St. Louis, but the tricolour of the revolution. Its King was not Philip VII "King of France by the Grace of God," but Louis Philippe I, "King of the French by the will of the people." Before the representatives he took this oath: "I swear before God to keep faithfully the constitutional charter, to rule only according to the laws, . . . and to act in all things according to just views of the interest, the happiness and the glory of the French people."

For nearly eighteen years Louis Philippe played the part of a good middle class king, the father of his people, benevolent, peaceful, constitutional. There is no need to charge him with insincerity because he accepted the idea of a parliamentary king, as the contemporary Hanoverians did in England. Of course, if the King ruled France by hereditary divine right, Louis Philippe would not be on the throne at all. But he was not the first man nor the last man whose political opinions have been determined by his interests.

Whatever his political theory, he played the simple rôle of a constitutional king; just as Napoleon, by word,

by costuming and by background, had played up to his heroic rôle of the successor of Charlemagne. Louis Philippe, was more accessible in his palace than even our presidents are in the White House. This wasted a good deal of time, but then his time was not worth much. Although a king he practiced the simple life and took walks in the streets accompanied only by a family umbrella.

The Monarchy, though it was constitutional, was not democratic. There was a high property qualification for voters so that, out of eight millions of men twenty-five years and more old, only two hundred thousand, or one in forty, could vote, and the liberal party in the Chamber of Deputies could not get a majority for the extension of the suffrage.

The revolution of 1830 had been won by the republicans of Paris and their hero was Lafayette. Processions of working men sang as they paraded before the palace windows: "Brave French people, liberty opens her arms. . . . To break the massed ranks of despotism who leads our bleeding banners? It is the liberty of two worlds, the white-haired Lafayette." Lafayette was not only the hero of the revolt; he was also the king maker for Louis Philippe. But he had no influence over the King he had made. Dissatisfied with the government as established, he resigned the command of the national guard of Paris and, as his parting advice, suggested a chamber of deputies elected by a much broader suffrage, a house of peers appointed by the king from candidates elected by the people and a ministry made up entirely of liberals. Four years later he died and the ideals both of liberal monarchy and of republican freedom, lost their best incarnation, known not only in France and America, but through all Europe. For it was a German who said: "Lafayette is the only beautiful figure of our modern times. He is nearly eighty and he still believes in virtue, liberty and justice."

The republican party which had accepted the new monarchy largely by the influence of Lafayette, soon became, like him, discontented with it. But the party was undisciplined, unable to agree on a programme and with small practical political capacity. Therefore the King had little difficulty in realizing, slowly and with patient craft, his ideas about his place in the state. He did not explicitly break oath to the charter, but, while he kept the letter of the law, he destroyed the spirit of the constitution. Like George the Third in England during the previous century, Louis Philippe used the constitution to consolidate his own power until he gradually came to rule as well as reign. There were ten attempts to assassinate him and his troops suppressed some local insurrections: a savage one at Lyons where insurgent artisans fought ten thousand soldiers for four days of slaughter. But he kept his even way, yielding where he must, and regaining this year what he had lost the year before.

There was a good deal of corruption and a huge amount of petty politics, passing the days, as one royal minister wrote to another, "in weighing in balances made of spider webs the number of fourth class postoffices granted to one faction and the number of tobacco shops (a government monopoly) granted to another."

After 1840, a considerable and increasing number of Frenchmen were steadily growing bored, disgusted and angered over the policy of the King both at home and abroad. Although the population and the wealth of France had increased under Louis Philippe, there was nowhere any body of people who had for him an active feeling of loyalty. He paid but little attention to public opinion and for years read no newspaper except the London *Times* for its foreign news. He was evidently extremely astonished when Paris rose in a dangerous insurrection.

It was not spontaneous but the result of the efforts of

liberal politicians. The most conspicuous means used were cheap banquets where orators discussed the need of reform. About seventy such banquets were organized in a short time, at which there were seventeen thousand guests. The action of the government in forbidding one of these affairs in Paris provoked rioting. The national guard called out to suppress it sang the Marseillaise and cheered for the Republic. The regular troops acted feebly, for the King shrank from bloodshed. The insurrection gradually spread and a great band of revolutionists took the undefended Tuileries. The furniture of the King's room was broken and the throne destroyed. Meanwhile the King, who had abdicated, was riding at full gallop toward St. Cloud.

So the King fell before an insurrection which he was unwilling to fight and that minority of the nation which had for the second time deposed a King, proclaimed the Republic.

CHAPTER L

THE SECOND REPUBLIC. THE SECOND EMPIRE

Many Frenchmen were a little shy of the term republic which recalled stories told by their fathers of the guillotine and irredeemable paper currency. Paris, however, wanted a Republic and France had no strong reason to fight against it. The provisional revolutionary government received the adhesion of the courts of justice and all the generals of the army. The Archbishop of Lyons called on his clergy to set an example of obedience to the Republic "under that liberty which makes your American brothers so happy," and most of the archbishops and bishops of France joined him.

One of the earliest things done by the provisional government was to abolish all property qualification for voters: which had not yet been done in all the states of the United States. This increased the voters from 250,000 to over 9,000,000 and gave France the broadest suffrage in Europe.

The election returned, among the 880 members of the Constituent Assembly, about 600 republicans (moderate and advanced) and about 300 monarchists; Orleanists (who accepted the Republic) and Legitimists. This was a triumph of democracy. But though the French people wished a government resting on a broad suffrage, it was nearly thirty years before they definitely decided upon the form of that government which they preferred; whether a popular empire, a constitutional monarchy or a republic.

The new assembly elected an Executive Commission of five whose President was Jean Arago, director of the na-

tional observatory and "a discoverer in the realm of physics of international reputation." With the aid of Lamartine, a distinguished poet and historian who had much political influence, he obtained the abolition of slavery in spite of the opposition of the interests which profited by it. For centuries indeed Frenchmen had boasted that any slave who set foot on French soil was freed and England had long made the same declaration. Nevertheless, slavery had continued in the colonies of both countries. Just before the meeting of the Estates General of 1789, "The Society of Friends of the Blacks" had been formed. Its avowed object was the total abolition not only of the slave trade but of slavery itself and it included among its adherents many of the most influential men of the day—Lafayette, Mirabeau, etc. The French Revolution did partially abolish slavery but Napoleon restored it. Now, in 1848, ten years after England and seventeen years before its abolition in the United States, it was abolished under the tricolour.

The first problem the forming government had to meet was a revolt. The provisional government, on the day after the proclamation of the Republic, had "guaranteed the right of work" and promised "to save the workman's family from misery when he is unable to work." To carry out these pledges national workshops had been established. Workmen began to pour into them from all parts of France and within a month they increased from six to thirty-six thousand. Two months later there were more than 100,000 workmen and there were no more trees to plant or streets to fix. The government therefore determined to close the workshops; all the men in them from 17 to 25 were ordered to enlist in the army and the others were to hold themselves ready to be sent to different departments; wherever there was work with pick and shovel. The answer was an insurrection of the quarters of Paris where the hand workers lived. When Arago

went out to talk to them they called out in reply: "Oh Mr. Arago you have never been hungry."

The government had 50,000 regular troops besides the national guards of many quarters of Paris. The fight was desperate. The Archbishop of Paris stepped in between the fighting lines holding aloft a crucifix and fell by a stray bullet; like a true servant of the Prince of Peace. The government forces were completely victorious but they had more than three thousand killed and wounded.

One of the nominees for president was Louis Napoleon, son of a brother of the Emperor. He was then forty years old and had led a wandering life. Two feeble attempts to organize rebellion in the French army brought him successively banishment to America and six years imprisonment in the fortress of Ham; whence he had escaped to England. Elected to the Constituent Assembly, his first speech was such a failure that his adversaries contemptuously abandoned a proposed law excluding him from becoming a candidate for the presidency.

There is, therefore, nothing but his name to account for his extraordinary hold upon the imagination of the mass of the French people. In 1848 he received five and a half millions of votes; nearly two thirds of all cast for President. Three years later when the Assembly had by restrictions on the suffrage reduced the number of electors from 9,000,000 to 6,000,000, he dismissed it and closed its meeting hall by soldiers in order, as he proclaimed, to prevent it from "overthrowing the Republic." Appealing to universal suffrage, his action and his continuance in office were confirmed by over 7,000,000 votes. A year later the question "Does the French people desire the re-establishment of a hereditary Empire in the person of Napoleon Bonaparte?" received 7,800,000 ayes to 250,000 noes. Just before the close of his reign of twenty-two years, a fourth popular vote gave him, out of 11,000,-

000 voters: 7,350,000 ayes to 1,570,000 noes on his appeal to "dissipate the danger of revolution, to assure on a solid base order and liberty and to render more easy the transmission of the crown to my son."

The cause of this extraordinary survival and recrudescence of loyalty to a name, is probably what historians call the "Napoleon legend." By this they mean that view of the character and career of Napoleon Bonaparte which originated in his own writings and those of his friends at St. Helena. This presents him as the indispensable saviour of France invaded by all the tyrants of Europe, the only possible maintainer of law and prosperity against Jacobin greed, inflation and bloodshed; the armed soldier of democracy for the oppressed nations of Europe, the self sacrificing lover of liberty, using the sword only to establish order and peace. The study of Napoleon's correspondence, published by order of Napoleon III, has made historians of all nations extremely sceptical about the entire accuracy of this self portrait. But the Napoleon legend was taken as authentic gospel by the great mass of the French peasants and dwellers in small towns until after the collapse of the Empire of his nephew.

The ideal of Napoleon III was a rule as absolute as that of his uncle, and for a considerable part of his reign, he succeeded in paralysing all public opposition. Even private criticism was dangerous. An actor was imprisoned for a joke in a café about the ill success of the Russian war and a distinguished professor of philosophy was summoned by the police and warned to be more careful of what he said in his own house about the government. In the latter part of the reign of Napoleon III, when Paris elected a solid list of anti-government candidates by a vote of seven to one, he relaxed somewhat this pressure, allowed the formation of a political opposition and accepted many features of a parliamentary régime. But he did so very unwillingly and he kept the direction of as many

things as possible in his own hands. In particular the foreign policy of the Empire was his own and it was his foreign policy which finally ruined him and humiliated France.

His home policy included many things which belong to good government. Cities were rebuilt, harbours were improved, much was done through state aid to enlarge communications by canal and railroad, agriculture and forestry were promoted, a liberal tariff policy was adopted and he was among the first to inaugurate laws whose prime motive was to render the lot of the hand worker easier. The population and the wealth of France increased and the state loans required for these improvements were readily absorbed at home.

Napoleon III waged three wars.

He joined England in defending Turkey against Russia. The army which took the seaport of Sebastapol after a siege full of terrible suffering for the soldiers, was sixty per cent French. But France, whose real interests were not at stake, got nothing out of the peace except such satisfaction as she might find in the fact that it was signed with a quill pulled out of an eagle in the Zoological Garden at Paris. Napoleon, however, got what he wanted—an important rôle on the stage of European diplomacy where the rulers of France had played no large part since 1815.

He used his prestige to intervene against Austria in defense of Italian national unity. This action as a champion of liberation and nationality was in accord with the general European position of France. The revolution of 1830 which drove Charles X a fugitive to England had been the signal for more or less violent demands for liberal constitutions in many capitals of Europe. These movements had been successful in some states but generally they had been suppressed and a crowd of exasperated liberal exiles took refuge, first in Switzerland and then in

England and the United States. The fall of the government of Louis Philippe in 1848 found, therefore, agitation going on in many quarters in favour of liberal and national governments and, for the third time, a revolt in favour of liberty in France was imitated by insurrection from one end of Europe to the other; notably in Austria, Prussia, Hungary and many German states. The impression that these liberalizing movements toward democracy had been, as it were, waiting for the word from Paris, is deepened by observing that they all echoed the watchwords of the Paris insurgents; a national militia, the liberty of the press, a constitutional assembly, universal suffrage and the right of self determination.

The Italian war brought Napoleon III the prestige of two victories—Magenta and Solferino: very hard fought and bloody battles. The prestige which might have come to him as the defender of the cause of free Italy was dimmed by the fact that he had been secretly promised Nice and Savoy, if the population consented to the transfer. But the complete justification for the annexation of Nice and Savoy is no secret treaty. It rests on the free consent of their inhabitants. The people of Savoy were thorough Frenchmen and not Italians and the people of Nice much more Provençal than Piedmontese. Savoy had been part of France by the wish of its people from 1792 to 1814. There is no reason for wonder or explanation that the vote on annexation to France under Napoleon III gave in Nice 15,000 ayes to 160 noes and in Savoy 136,000 ayes to 517 noes.

During our civil war the popular feeling of France was in favour of the North because of the support given to slavery by the South. But the Emperor and his courtiers, like most of the English tories, preferred the southern planters, who were people of good society, fine horsemen with distinguished manners, etc. In addition the blockade shut off cotton from the French factories. Na-

poleon, whose active imagination was not always guided by critical reflection, was attracted by the idea of establishing in opposition to a Protestant English speaking federated republic, now as he hoped about to split into two parts, a Latin, Catholic, centralized empire. By using an army of 35,000 men he set up as Emperor of Mexico, the Archduke Maximilian, a brother of the Emperor of Austria. He persisted in this attempt in spite of a protest in the French Chamber of Deputies that: "neither our principles nor our interests advise our going to see what sort of a government the Mexican people want" and he gave no heed to the objections of the United States, obliged by the civil war to bear this flagrant defiance of our hereditary policy expressed in the Monroe Doctrine.

But, a year after the new Emperor landed in Mexico, our civil war ended, leaving the United States with a million veteran soldiers. Our Secretary of State directed our embassy to say to the French Emperor, in terms more gentle than we would have used to any government other than our ancient friend and ally: "We should think it wrong for the United States to attempt by force to replace monarchical governments in Europe by republics. It seems to us equally objectionable that European states should forcibly replace republics on this continent by monarchies or empires. . . . I leave the question for the consideration of France, sincerely hoping that that great nation may find it compatible with its high honour to withdraw from its aggressive attitude in Mexico within some convenient time. . . . Friendship with France has always been deemed peculiarly agreeable by the American people. Every American deems it no less desirable for the future than for the past." The French troops were withdrawn and within two months of the sailing of the last guards, the Emperor Maximilian was a prisoner in the hands of his enemies.

The fall of the Empire of Napoleon was caused by the

terrible defeat of the war of 1870. The cause of this war was rivalry between France and Prussia and Bismarck's need of a victorious war to consolidate the German Empire with Prussia as the corner stone. The occasion of it was the choice by the head of the revolutionary government of Spain of a German prince, secretly suggested by Bismarck, to replace as sovereign the expelled Queen Isabella. The protest of France was met by the withdrawal of the German prince, but the Imperial government insisted on a promise of the King of Prussia, as head of the family, that he never would permit the prince to accept the crown of Spain.

The Minister of the Interior had asked the prefects of the eighty-three departments of France to sound public opinion in regard to war and all but fifteen replied that the public did not want war. But Napoleon and a warlike clique around him, let Bismarck jockey him into declaring war. Bismarck has himself explained how the commander-in-chief of the army and his chief of staff were dining with him when he received the famous telegram telling of the interview between the French Ambassador and the King of Prussia in the park of the baths at Ems. Like him, the two heads of the army longed for war and were much cast down at the peaceful import of the message. He wrote a paraphrase of it with which they were delighted saying "that rings like the flourish of a trumpet in answer to a challenge." Bismarck said: "It is essential that we should be in the rôle of the attacked. If I send this text to the newspapers, it will soon be known at Paris and it will be like a red rag to the Gallic bull."

The Imperial government reacted to Bismarck's provocation just as he had hoped—by blundering headlong into war and the necessary credits were voted by the legislature. But in the debate, Thiers told the truth in a speech of which it has been said that it made him afterwards ruler of France. He demanded: "Do you want all Europe to say that, when the essential part of the problem

was settled, you decided to shed torrents of blood for a mere question of form?" He ended his speech by refusing to be in any way responsible for a war which had "so little justification." Gambetta, often hailed as the founder of the Third Republic, demanded that the insult to France should be more clearly demonstrated before going to war. These voices of men who suspected Bismarck's subtlety, were lost in the excitement. Only eleven members of the Chamber voted against the credits for war.

Never in modern times has a brave nation received so crushing a defeat. In six months the French had lost 350,000 men, their armies were destroyed and Paris, after a heroic defense, was in the hands of the invaders. According to the statements of their enemies the French soldiers fought with the utmost courage and the causes of defeat seem to have been slowness in mobilization, a mistaken strategy, lack of arms and supplies and above all, inferiority of commanding officers.

The surrender of the Emperor at Sedan with 83,000 men six weeks after the declaration of war, brought about the fall of the Empire by a bloodless revolution. A new National Assembly containing 400 royalists, 200 republicans and less than 30 imperialists made peace by a promise to pay in five years 5,000,000,000 francs. Of this sum 1,000,000,000 was indemnity for the expenses of war, 1,000,000,000 was spent in fortresses, cannon, railroads, etc. and 3,000,000,000 was ransom, divided as a sort of cash bonus among the German states which had joined Prussia in making war. In addition Alsace and Lorraine, against the bitter protests of the representatives elected by their million and a half inhabitants, were ceded to the new German Empire.

To carry out this peace and maintain order, the Assembly put temporarily at the head of the government, the historian and statesman Thiers, elected to the assembly by 26 departments and more than 2,000,000 votes. He gathered 130,000 soldiers and suppressed in two months

the last and bloodiest of the insurrections of the hand worker's quarters of Paris; the Commune; a name which has been mistakenly assumed to mean an international communist insurrection. It was an expression of local causes of discontent and of suspicion and dislike for a Chamber of Deputies with a majority of monarchists.

That this majority did not re-establish a monarchy in France was due chiefly to the head of the family of Bourbon, the Count of Chambord. The red, white and blue, the flag of the Republic, the Empire, the moderate Monarchy and the Second Empire was dear to the hearts of all Frenchmen; except the surviving believers in monarchy by divine right. The Count of Chambord issued an entirely superfluous proclamation declaring that, if France wanted him, she must take with him the white flag of the Bourbons. " . . . It floated over my cradle, I want it to shade my tomb. . . . Frenchmen, Henry V cannot abandon the white flag of Henry IV." Henry IV could turn a rhetorical phrase with the best of them. But his rhetoric never ran away with his shrewd common sense. He who was supposed to have said "Paris is worth a mass," would certainly have said "France is worth a flag." No wonder Thiers dryly remarked, on reading this proclamation: "The Count of Chambord deserves to be called the French Washington, for he has founded the Republic."

The third Republic was none too securely founded. Thiers was elected chief executive in August 1871. When he resigned two years later, he was replaced by Marshal MacMahon, an able soldier and an extremely honest man, known to dislike the Republican form of government but faithful to his oath of office, who found himself in a position not dissimilar to the present position of another soldier, faithful to his oath of office, President von Hindenburg of the German Republic.

It was not until January 1875 that the Chamber de-

clared itself in favour of a permanent republic and the vote was 353 to 352. Two years later, in spite of every influence brought to bear by the government, the elections returned a new Chamber with a large Republican majority. The growth of the Republican vote has continued, until now, at the end of fifty years, the Monarchists and Bonapartists have shrunk to inconsiderable minorities and none of the governments of Europe (many of which are more recent) is less in danger of abolition than the French Republic.

EPILOGUE

THE STEADFAST REPUBLIC

CHAPTER LI

When the Estates General of France met at Versailles in 1789, it was one hundred and seventy-five years since there had been an assembly of representatives of the nation. For the next eighty years, France was never without a National Assembly. But none of these assemblies were able to create a stable government. During that period France had twelve governments: three republics, two empires, five monarchies, a consulate and a brief military dictatorship.

The present Republic has endured for fifty-nine years, within ten years of half as long as our Republic. For the first five years of its life it was manifestly in imminent danger of falling like the eleven governments before it. What reason is there to believe that it is now steadfast? Was there any real danger of the fulfilment of the gossipping and irresponsible prophecies circulating just before the formation of the present Poincaré cabinet, that France would for the third time abandon a republic in favour of some other form of government?

The enormous growth of the number of republican deputies in the National Assembly, the corresponding decline in the roll of deputies who call themselves monarchists and the small number of radicals who prefer a communist tyranny like that of Moscow, are the most direct answers to such a question. But there are certain other elements, entirely outside the realm of politics, which afford even stronger guarantees of the stability of the French Republic.

The distribution of property in France is probably more even than in any other highly civilized country in the world. Rich men are comparatively rare and only one estate in twenty-five, now left by will, exceeds a

thousand dollars in value. The French have inherited a habit of hiding their savings in their homes and the "money of the woolen stockings" (the peasant's safe deposit box) is a phrase which represents a very large sum in hidden francs and a considerable proportion of the national wealth in cash. Yet in spite of this habit, inherited from the days when banks were scarce, there are enough bank accounts in France to make two for every family.

By a long process, the results of which are already observable in the later middle ages, which was strengthened by the confiscation of the property of the Church during the revolution, the laws of inheritance of the Napoleonic code and the break up of the large estates of the "new poor" during the late war, the landed property of France is subdivided in a very remarkable way. Of the 5,702,752 farms in France at the end of the nineteenth century, 85 percent (nearly five million) contained less than twenty-five acres, 13½ percent contained from twenty-five to one hundred and twenty-five acres and less than 1½ percent contained over a hundred and twenty-five acres. To the danger of communist revolution based on new theories about rights of property, France, because of the great distribution of property among her people, would seem to be immune.

To this sense of having a stake in the country the average Frenchman adds another element of contentment; his self respecting pride in his calling in life whatever it may be. The road mender, who uses the little heaps of stone deposited for repairs along the side of the highway, feels that he is a necessary part of the social economy; he has a certain pride in his calling and something equivalent in its sphere and kind to a professional sense.

Skill in various sorts of handicraft is very widely diffused among the French people. On the whole, this is

not the result of training in government schools, although there are strong government schools for training in the industrial arts—especially in those where the artistic element is preponderant. But the skill meant is a sort of hereditary family possession like the six million farms owned chiefly by the families of French peasants. The owner of a considerable factory in the north of France told the writer that he had, working his looms, numbers of artisans skilled in the weaving of fine cloth, whose forebears had been in the employ of his forebears from three to six generations. An old woman sitting in the sun beside her door, juggling her bobbins to make the piece of intricate lace on the pillow before her, explained with pride that she knew a score of patterns learned when she was young from her mother and grandmother. When the pioneers of wine making began to build up the production of wine in the Ohio valley, they brought over peasants from Burgundy or the Médoc where vineyards had been cultivated and grape juice handled for generations. The sheep, goat or cattle raisers around Pont-l'Evêque and other agricultural centres, inherit their knowledge of how to make delicious cheeses with their flocks and herds. The outstanding milliners and dressmakers whose names are known from "China to Peru" are only the organizers and guides of the skill in the fingers of the flocks of "luncheon girls" who swarm at noon out of their workshops over the boulevards of Paris like flocks of little gayly chattering birds.

This diffusion of skill and respect for it, in France, is the chief cause why there is no country in the world where hand workers find so much satisfaction in the ordinary hours of life because of their pleasure in their own skill—a pleasure which is centred, not simply in the money they earn by it, but in their pride in what they do by it.

This contentment in the ordinary hours of life, react-

ing on the temperament which has prevailed in the social life of the greater part of France, is the soil in which grows their gaiety, a simple gaiety, able to dispense with organized amusements, frugal in expense, unstimulated by too much alcohol, able to be happy without the excitement of rushing from one place to another in automobiles, which the poverty following the war prevents most Frenchmen from owning. The meaning of the writer will be plain to any one who has watched the neighbourhood dances in the streets of French cities on their Fourth (the Fourteenth) of July, or seen the whole family, from grandfather to the baby, eating supper and playing games Sunday evening on the grass of a Paris park.

The skill he possesses, the average Frenchman uses with industry. He fails to understand what the American means by "hustling." He lacks an equivalent term in his speech because he lacks the thing in his experience. But he works with a certain leisurely persistence which gets an enormous amount done. The patient and brave industry which recently restored northern France, ruined even to the soil of the fields, is one of the marvels of history. But it is nothing new. Again and again France has rapidly conquered by her peaceful industry the most terrible devastations of war.

This thrift and economy, this self respecting pride in work, this skill and industry, have brought it to pass that France, in spite of her terrible financial distress, has suffered very much less since the war from unemployment than any other of the more important nations and is now practically free from that most saddening of all social ills.

Another source of contentment and stability in France is the strength of family life. There is no mother in the world who occupies a higher position of authority through influence than the French mother. The absurd statement is often made that the French have no word for "home"; generally with the implication that they have not the

thing. As a matter of fact they have both the thing and the word. · *Foyer* is accurately translated by the English word hearth in the old double phrase "hearth and home," and many French families have not yet changed their hearth for a radiator. If they did it would not alter the fact that family life is the base of the whole French conception and practice in social organization. Their attitude toward marriage is a product of the feeling that it is not merely the romantic adjustment of two individuals, but the beginning of a new social unit.

Thrift, industry, self respect, the love of beauty, clear thinking, family affection, contentment, gaiety; these qualities do not create the atmosphere which breeds revolutions.

The modern Frenchman loves his country—let the Marne and Verdun bear testimony how much—but his patriotism is not of the aggressive type and his clear intelligence suggests to him that other peoples have the right also to love their countries as he loves his country. The century which followed Waterloo was a century when France was not involved in European war; except that she joined England and Russia in securing the independence of Greece by the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino (1827); as we secured the independence of Cuba by destroying the Spanish fleet at Santiago. This century of peace was broken, about the middle, by a period of seventeen years in which Napoleon III fought Russia, Austria, Mexico and Germany. But these wars were not the wars of the French people—the French people had nothing to say about foreign policy under the rule of Napoleon III.

When Napoleon III was gone, France had forty-four years of peace from which she was aroused by a most terrible war in which she and her allies won a sweeping victory. But this victorious war has brought to her untold suffering. Out of a total population one third the

size of ours, France had nearly two million men, the very flower of her young manhood, killed or maimed, and a huge extent of her territory devastated. In addition she was saddled for generations with a debt so great that it drove her almost to bankruptcy.

To suppose that the French people, after over forty years' experience of the blessings of peace, crowned by four years' experience of war and the anguish and ruin it has brought even to the victors, have any love for fighting, is to assume that they are utterly lacking in intelligence and common sense: and so far as I know there is no one, even among the most intensely prejudiced of their enemies, who accuses them of that particular lack.

General Gouraud has recently said: "To imagine that the French, who have suffered so much in the war and still have such heavy burdens to bear as a result of it, wish the return of war is ridiculous. The memories of her sorrows impel France doubly to desire peace and security."

The modern Frenchman loves more to think about peace than about war. There are two arches of triumph in Paris. Both of these monuments are due to Napoleon, who also put up the Column Vendôme. The great Arc de Triomphe with the twelve streets, nine bearing the names of battles, radiating from it is the work of Napoleon completed by his nephew.

But the monuments of Paris taken as a whole speak of peace and celebrate the great men of art, letters, science, politics and philanthropy. Of four hundred and twenty-nine of the monuments and statues in Paris, outside of those named, only nine represent fighting people; of which two are of Joan of Arc and two are statues of Washington and Lafayette given by America. Four hundred and three of the statues of Paris have no relation to war; more than half of them represent civilians, or subjects of peaceful allegory like art, commerce, industry,

etc. The rest are divided between mythology, history and general subjects; and the only reference to war among them is war of the animals shown in the groups of Cain.

France is grateful beyond expression to the soldiers who saved her from destruction and she shows it, not by the beating of drums in adulation of conquering heroes, but in the cult of the unknown soldier: the average Frenchman who laid down his life to defend his home and died that France, in the words of Lincoln about America, "might not perish from the earth." That cult of the unknown soldier is very far from the worship of military glory. His tomb, wherever it may be, is not a monument to the pride of conquest. It is the altar of patriotism, whereon is continually celebrated the sacrament of thankful remembrance for humble self sacrifice. Into this consecration of the best side of warlike virtue, it was France with her delicacy of feeling and lucidity of thought, who led the world.

Of all the mistaken judgments propagated since the war by people interested or misinformed, none is greater than the conclusion that France maintains an army because she wants to keep it, instead of because she fears she may need it. Her attitude is precisely that of our forefathers in the days of the Indian wars who kept the rifle beside the door, not because they wanted to fight, but because they were afraid they might have to.

When modern France reviews the roll of her mighty dead, she recognizes her greatest son of the past century, who won for her the most lasting fame in the records of the world, not in Napoleon Bonaparte, but in Louis Pasteur, whose teaching has saved the lives and lessened the sufferings of far more men than died or were wounded in the wars of Napoleon. Pasteur has been called "the most striking figure in nineteenth century science." He opened new paths in biology, chemistry, physics, medicine and surgery and "his work has changed

the whole aspect of the cure and treatment of disease." So that the President of Columbia University could fairly say "Pasteur is, I suppose, the greatest single benefactor the human race has ever known."

Undismayed by an attack of paralysis at the age of forty-six, he preached by word and example until his death at seventy-three, the duty of working "for France and for humanity" as the highest patriotism; which he thus defined in a speech at Milan: "Gentlemen, I offer a toast to the peaceful strife of science. It is the first time that I have had the honour to be present at an international scientific congress on foreign soil. I am profoundly impressed by two thoughts: the first is that science has no country, the second is that science is the highest personification of country. Science has no country because knowledge is the patrimony of humanity, the torch which lights the world. Science ought to be the highest personification of country because that nation will always be the first of all nations which shall lead in the labours of thought and intelligence."

When this professor of chemistry had died, one hand held in the hand of his wife and the other touching in humble faith a crucifix, the President of the Republic, both Houses of the National Assembly, the entire government of the City of Paris and a huge crowd, followed the funeral procession. A popular subscription put a great monument to him opposite the Invalides and the French people have dedicated to Pasteur more memorials than to Napoleon.

These and other considerations justify the observation of a keen observer by no means prejudiced in favour of the French. "France is the most pacific country today in existence. . . . There is no place where war is more hated." [Struthers Burt.]

In support of this conclusion a witness can be cited whom no one could accuse of unwillingness to defend his

native land. In the recent convention of the American Legion at Paris, General Pershing said: "The longing for peace today fills the minds of untold millions. . . . The assembling of the American Legion in France is not merely a reunion of veterans, but the joining together of two great nations having the same passionate love of peace." To which Marshal Foch replied: "No other country will understand your wish for peace better than France. In the days of anguish, Pershing came leading the American Army and said 'Lafayette, we are here.' Today . . . the American Legion says 'Forward for peace and liberty.' . . . Where is the Frenchman who would not answer the call?"

In this strongly peaceful temper of the overwhelming majority of Frenchmen lies one of the chief securities of the French Republic. Long ago it was said that those who take the sword often perish by the sword and, of recent experiences of some governmental establishments, it may be said, at the very least, that they are not incongruous with the ancient proverb.

INDEX

INDEX

Abelard, rise of, influence on University of Paris of, 125; egotism of, heresy and imprisonment of, 126
Absolutism, development of, 327-334
Academie Française, 347, 348, 367
Academy of Architecture, 368
Academy of Painting, 368
Academy of Science, 418, 419
Academy of Sculpture, 368
Acton, Lord, quoted, 299
Adams, quoted, 433
Addison, 387
Agen, 270
Agincourt, battle of, 206
Agriculture, Royal Society of, 419
Aix la Chapelle, 54, 64; Charlemagne's chapel at, 59; peace of, 374, 415
Alberoni, Cardinal, 413
Albert the Great, 182
Albigensian crusade, 117
Alcuin, 57
Alemanni, the, 26
Alençon, Duke of, 209, 233, 297
Alps, the, 5
Alexander of Hales, 182
Alexander Severus, Emperor, 25
Alexandria, 481
Alsace, territories gained by France by peace of Westphalia in, 353; demanded by Prussia, 495; ceded to German Empire, 511
Amboise, art colony at, 262; Château of, 282; classical buildings at, 263
America, French help for Colonies in, 428-430; influence of on French Estates, 442
American Legion, the, 525
Amiens, 26, 203; Cathedral of, 119
Amyot, Jacques, 317
Anabaptists, the, 274, 275
Anagni, 173
Angers, University of, 226
Anjou, Count of, 106; Duke of, 203, 227
Anne, daughter of Louis XI, 241
Anne, of Brittany, 241
Anne, Regent of France, 349
Antilles, the, 366
Aquinas, Thomas, 126, 182
Aquitaine, Duke of, 102, 228
Aquitanians, the, 67
Arabs, the, defeat of by Charles Martel, 50, 51
Arago, Jean, 503
Aragon, 169
Arc de Triomphe, 522
Archæology, Museum of, 474
Architecture, early Roman, 31; Romanesque, 68, 84-87; Gothic, 119; Flemish-Burgundian, 225; of Renascence, 260, 263-265
Aretino, 367, 421
Aristotle, 182
Arles, 26; kingdom of, 306
Armagnac, Duke of, 206
Arras, tapestries of, 226
Art, 58, 259, 264
Arthur, 139; legend of, 181
Athanasius, Bishop, 44
Aubrac, 5
Aucassin and Nicolette, 139-143
Augsburg, League of, 376
Augustus, 20, 21, 23
Aulard, quoted, 464, 468, 484, 485
Ausonius, 32, 33
Austerlitz, 491
Austria, House of, 378; defeat at Jemappes of, 546; peace forced by Napoleon upon, 479; member of coalition against France, 481; Prussia blocked by jealousy of, 495
Austrian Succession, War of, 414
Autun, 32
Auvergne, 160
Auxerre, Bishop of, 317; Count of, 167
Avars, the, 53

Bailly, 465
Balzac, Guez de, 404
Banking and commerce under Philip II, 114
Barbarism, spread of, 41
Barry, du, Madame, 415, 416, 459
Bar-sur-Aube, 114
Basle, 275
Bastard, the, brother of Duke of Orleans, 215
Bastille, the, fall of, 438; significance of, 439
Batavian Republic, 491
Baton Rouge, 488
Baudouin de Sebourc, 180

Bavarians, the, 102
Bayard, 252
Beatrice, 149
Beaugency, 277
Beaumanoir, Seigneur de, 179
Beauvais, 26
Bedford, Duke of, 208
Belgae, the, 16
Belgium, annexed to France, 456
Bellay, du, Joachim, 311; quoted, 258
Benedictines, the, 104, 123
Berg, 491
Berlin, Academy of, 407
Berthollet, 480
Besançon, 32
Bethune, de, Maximilien, 329-334
Beza, 291
Béziers, 117, 203
Bible, the, 145, 182
Birague, 298
Bismarck, 510, 511
Black Prince, the, 193
Blenheim, battle of, 378
Blois, 263, 450
Blücher, 493
Boccaccio, 148, 246, 272
Boileau, 405
Bonaparte, Jerome, 492
Bonaparte, Joseph, 492
Bonaparte, Lucien, 483, 493
Bonaparte, Napoleon, origin and early life of, 485, 486; qualities of, 470, 480, 486, 487; made commander-in-chief of army of interior, 472; victories in Italy and Austria of, 479; address to army in Italy of, 479; art trophies brought to Paris by, 480; expedition to Cairo of, 481; made First Consul, 483; dictatorship of, 484; gradual change in administration by, 485; proclaimed Emperor, 487; victory of Marengo won by, 487; northern Italy rearranged into republics by, 487; lack of success in colonization of, 488, 489; peace made with Church by, 489; financial and educational reforms of, the Napoleonic University made by, 489, 490; legal code established by, 490; disposal of Holland, Italy, Prussia, and Hanover by, 491, 492; unsuccessful attempt at "continental blockade" made by, 492; six European coalitions against, 491-493; defeats at Leipzig and Paris of, 493; first abdication of, 493; defeat at Waterloo of, 493; second abdication and sentence to St. Helena of, 494; eulogy on Washington made by, 486, 487; Marshal Foch's comment on career of, 494.
Boniface VIII, Pope, 171, 173
Book of Martyrs, the, 279
Book of the Secrets of the Philosophers, 183
Bordeaux, 32, 213, 463; Archbishop of, 174, 443; Parlement of, 396; University of, 226
Bossuet, 315, 351, 397, 406
Boulle, André, 365
Bourbon, Anthony of, 276, 281, 283; Cardinal of, 285, 303; Duke of, 227, 228, 233; house of, 282, 378, 512
Bourdaloue, 406
Bourg, du, 278
Bourges, 221
Bouvines, battle of, 111
Brabant, 373
Braddock, 416
Brantôme, 300
Brazil, 492
Brémule, battle of, 80
Brest, 448
Brétigny, Treaty of, 193
Breton Romances, the, 138
Bretons, the, 67
Brissac, Marshal, 255
Brissot, 458
Brittany, 306, 223, 241; Count of, 102; Duke of, 227, 233
Broussel, 354
Bruges, 177
Brune, General, 481
Brunot, quoted, 243
Brunswick, Duke of, 448, 468
Budé, Guillaume, 259, 268, 269
Bullant, 264
Burghers, the, 109, 113, 151, 194
Burgundians, the, 26, 41, 42
Burgundy, Duke of, 205, 208; Philip, Duke of, 224
Burt, Struthers, quoted, 524

Caen, University of, 226
Cæsar, Julius, 12-18
Cairo, 481
Calais, 206, 254; treaty of, 193
Calas, 436
Calligraphy, art of, under Charlemagne, 58
Calonne, 428
Calvin, John, 260, 273; quoted, 269; address to Francis I of, 275; importance in French literature of, 315

Calvinism, 276-279
Calvinist churches, status under Napoleon of, 489
Cambrai, 26; Archbishop of, 383
Canada, 365, 366, 417
Capet, Hugh, 66, 67
Carcassonne, 203
Carolingian dynasty, the, 50-66
Carpentras, 176
Carnot, 460, 464, 465
Cateau Cambrésis, peace of, 254-256
Catharists, the, 117
Cathedral building in 10th century, 85, 86
Cather, Willa, quoted, 332
Catherine, of France, 208
Catullus, 148
Cellini, Benvenuto, 263
Celts, the, 11
Cerceau, du, 264
Cevennes Mountains, the, 108; Calvinist insurrection in, 399
Chambord, Count of, 512
Champagne, the fairs of, 114; province of, 306
Channing, quoted, 476
Charlemagne, campaigns against Saracens and Avars, 52, 53; fleet and shipyards built by, 53; political system of, 54; civil administration of Church by, 54; influence for education of, 56-58, 122; extent of restoration of Roman state by, 59, 60; death of, 63; celebrated in Song of Roland, 131-136
Charles VI, of Austria, 414
Charles I, of England, 417
Charles II, of England, 371
Charles III, Duke of Lorraine, 306
Charles V, of France, 194, 200, 201, 202
Charles VI, of France, 203, 204, 205
Charles VII, of France, 216, 217, 219, 221, 233
Charles VIII, of France, 239-241, 248, 261, 262
Charles IX, of France, 283, 295, 296, 298
Charles X, of France, 497-499, 506
Charles V, of the Empire, 251
Charles, son of Pippin the Short, 52
Charles, the Simple, 65
Chartres, Bishop of, 164; Cathedral of, 120, 122
Chateaubriand, quoted, 442
Château Thierry, 387
Châtillon, Cardinal of, 285
Chaucer, 148, 308, 144
Chevalier, the, 76
Chivalry, 137, 152-158, 181
Christianity, 35, 42, 43-46, 52. See also Church.
Church, the, in France: effect of feudalism on, 89; reforms led by Hildebrand, 90; crusades of, 92-96; contrast of decorations used by, under St. Bernard and under Suger, 105; buildings increased, 119, 120; doctrines affected by abstract logic controversies, 124; influence upon chivalric ideal, 154, 155; claim to supreme authority, 170; the Babylonian Captivity, 219; Gallicanism, 219, 221; the Great Schism, 219; Council of Constance, 220; corruption in 16th century, 258; Lefevre's translation of New Testament, 270; the Huguenots, 282-302; Calvinism, 272-279; League of the Holy Trinity, 303; Huguenot party legalized, 308; doctrine of predestination, 316; revival of Catholicism, 340-343; Jansenism, 392; the "Unigenitus," 395; influence on French life in 18th century, 412; representation at Estates General, 431; personnel during reign of Louis XVI, 445; Voltaire's attack, 436; actions of National Assembly, 444-446; Catholic Church restored as social factor under the Directory, 472, 473; peace made with Church by Napoleon, 489
Cisalpine Republic, the, 480, 491
Cistercians, the, 151
Civil War, of U. S., 508, 509
Clagny, 370
Clairvaux, Abbot of, 103
Clement V, Pope, 176
Clothilde, 42
Clovis, 41, 42, 45
Cluny, 92, 151
Coblentz, 446
Code, legal, established by Napoleon, 490
Cœur, Jacques, 223, 225
Cobbett, William, quoted, 3, 4
Colbert, Jean Baptiste, 359-368
Coligny, 285, 286, 289, 290, 295-297
College de France, 268
Colonies, American, of France, 417, 428, 429, 430
Colonus, the, 36, 37
Column Vendôme, 522
Commines, Philip de, 239, 240; quoted, 235, 236, 237, 238, 262
Commune, the, 71, 113; of Paris,

451, 457, 467; correct meaning of, 512
Condé, Prince of, 283, 285, 288, 289, 298, 333, 351, 352
Constance, Council of, 219
Constituent Assembly, the, 503
Constitutional Charter, the, 495-499
Cop, Nicholas, 273
Corbeil, Count of, 101
Cordeliers, the, 449
Council of Regency, the, 411
Council of the Elders, 471
Council of the Five Hundred, 471
Courtrai, 176, 177, 204
Cravant, 58
Crécy, battle of, 191-193
Croce, quoted, 402
Cromwell, Oliver, 353, 359
Crusades, the, 92-96; journal of Ernoul during, 149; account of, by de Villehardouin, 149

Dagobert, 46
Damascus, siege of, 105
Damville, Marshal, 296
d'Andelot, 285
Danes, the, 65
Dante, 138, 144, 149, 245, 309
Danton, 449, 450
d'Aubigné, Agrippa, 282, 371, 404
Dauphin, the, 195, 196, 207, 208, 210, 233
Da Vinci, Leonardo, 263
D'Enghien, Duke, 351
Descartes, 404
Des Moines, 488
Detroit, 488
Dialogue, Between Body and Soul, 145
Dijon, 226
Diocletian, 26
Directory, the, 471, 476
Dominicans, 173, 182
Domitian, 22
Dubois, Abbé, the, 412, 413
Dubuque, 488
Dumouriez, General, 456, 459
Dunkirk, 353
Duodo, Pietro, quoted, 327-332
Dupleix, 416
Duquesne, Fort, 416
Dreyfus, 436
Druids, 14, 24

East India, 412
Ecole des Ponts et Chaussées, the, 419
Ecole Normale, the, 473
Ecorcheurs, the, 214, 215
Edict of January, the, 287
Edict of Nantes, the, 308
Edict of St. Germain, 295
Education, in France, under Charlemagne, 56-58, 122; scholasticism, 87, 88; revival of interest in learning, 122; Paris the center of, 122; the *Universitas*, 126; universities in the 15th century, 226; Humanism, 259; textbooks of Lefevre, 269; new institutions founded after the Revolution, 473, 474; secondary education and state university reorganized by Napoleon, 488, 489; government schools in modern France, 519
Edward III, of England, 188, 189, 200
Elba, island of, 493
Eleanor, wife of Louis VII, 106
Elizabeth of Valois, 306
Emigrés, the, 446
Empire, the, creation of, 487. See *Napoleon*
Ems, 510
England, Parliament of, 217; victorious armies of, in Spain, 492
Equality, Philip, 498
Erasmus, 259, 268
Ernoul, 149
Estates General, the, 202, 238, 242, 282, 284, 304, 335, 345, 425, 431
Eylau, 491

Farel, 260
Father Joseph, 339
Faubourg, St. Antoine, the, 471
Fénelon, François, 382
Feudalism, formation, organization, customs, etc., 68-96; confusing effects of on the French cities, 109; laws of, changeable by king, 113
Flanders, 111, 166, 189, 176; the Count of, 102, 203
Fléchier, 406
Fleury, Bishop, 413, 414
Florence, Grand Duke of, 367
Foch, Marshal, quoted, 487, 491, 494, 525
Foix, Gaston de, 249
Fontainebleau, 263
Fontanges, Mlle. de, 371
Fortescue, Sir John, 238, 247
Fouquet, Nicholas, 226, 359, 360
France, fertility of, 4, 5; territory of, 4, 5, 6; unity of, 9, 10; people of, their characteristics, 3, 17, 18, 187, 216, 261, 330, 518-525; language of, influence of Latin on, 31,

32; under Charlemagne, 64; dialects, 128, 129; vernacular in 12th century, 128; 266; spread of, under Louis XIV, 406, 407; property of, present distribution of, 517, 518
Franks, the, 26, 41
Francis I, 249; alliances formed by, 250; defeat at Pavia of, 251; love for beauty and learning of, 263; beginning of Reformation under, 273
Francis II, 281
Frederick the Great, 414, 416, 417
Friedland, 491
Froissart, Jean, quoted, 193; history written by, 240
Fronde, the, 354, 355

Gaillon, 263
Gallatin, Albert, quoted, 467
Gallic period. See *Gauls*
Gallienus, 25
Gambetta, 511
Garlande, 101
Ganelon, 131, 132, 135
Garonne, the, 117
Gauls, the, pre-Roman, 12-15; Roman conquest of, 15, 18; absorption into Roman Empire of, 19, 20; government of, under Rome, 24, 25, towns of, the impression made by on later French cities, 29, 30; architecture of, 31
Gazette de France, 346
Genet, 477, 478
Geneva, Bishop of, 341
Genoa, 376
Gerbert (Pope Silvester II), 88
Germans, Germany, 34, 41, 90, 102, 104, 111; in crusades, 93; heresy laws of, 118; birthplace of the Reformation, of the printing press, 246; German mercenaries at Moncontour, 290; Luther's comment on, 350; influence of French court upon, 406; member of 1799 coalition, 481
Ghent, 166, 189, 203
Gibbon, quoted, 25, 30, 31, 32
Gironde River, the, 6
Girondists, the, 456, 457, 460-466
Gobelins, the, 363, 368
Goeffroi de Preuilli, 157
Goethe, quoted, 452
Goths, the, 26
Gouraud, General, quoted, 522
Governments, of France, summarized, 517
Goujon, 264
Great Lakes, the, 366
Greece, 521
Gregory VII, Pope, 90-92
Gregory of Tours, 45
Grenoble, 58, 306; Parlement of, 217
Guesclin du, Bertrand, 200, 201
Guienne, 213, 216; Duke of, 189
Guise, Duke of, 253, 281, 282, 284, 288, 297, 298, 304

Habsburgs, the, 308, 353, 354, 378
Haganon, 77
Hainaut, 166
Hallam, quoted, 348
Hamilton, 477
Hanover, 492
Harfleur, 206
Harnack, quoted, 43
Haroun-al-Raschid, 95
Hassall, quoted, 384
Hébert, 464, 472
Heidelberg, 377
Heloise, 126
Helvetii, the, 15
Helvetic Republic, the, 491
Henry I, of England, 107
Henry II, of England, 107, 110, 111
Henry III, of England, 163
Henry V, of England, 206, 207, 208
Henry I, of France, 67
Henry II, of France, 253, 256, 257
Henry III, of France, 303-305
Henry IV, of France (Navarre), 306, 307, 318, 327, 332, 333
Heresy, 44, 45, 118, 303, 304, 277-284. See also *Church*.
Hildebrand (Gregory VII), 90
Hoche, 465
Holland, annexation to France of, 491
Holy See, the, 287
Hudson Bay, 377
Huguenots, the, 282-291; armies of, 292; close of third war of, 295; massacre of, 297-302; close of wars, 308; repression of, 396-399; prohibition of Canada to, 417-418
Hugh, Duke of the Franks, 66
Hugh the Great, 67
Humanism, Humanists, 259, 260, 273
Hundred Years War, the, 120, 188-193, 222

Iberians, the, 10, 11
Ingon, 77
Innocent III, Pope, 117, 126, 170
Institutes of the Christian Religion, the (Calvin), 274, 315-317

Intolerance, 55, 167, 277, 284, 290, 394, 396-398, 417, 468-469
Invalides, the, 524
Isabella, of Spain, 510
Isle de France, 303
Italy, 245, 479, 487, 491, 492, 507, 508

Jacobins, the, 437, 464, 467
Jacques, the, 196, 197
Jansen, Cornelius, 392
Jansenism, 392
Jefferson, quoted, 467, 468
Jemappes, battle of, 456
Jena, 491
Jerusalem, 93, 94, 103
Jews, the, 174, 203
Jesuits, the, 341, 393
Joan of Arc, early visions of, 209; leadership at Orleans of, 209; inspiration of French armies, 210; trial and death of, 211-213; legal justification of by Charles VII, 219; statue of, 522
John the Fearless, 205
John II, the Good, 193, 194
John of Salisbury, 126
Joinville, Jean, Sire de, 163, 164, 167, 239
Jourdan, 465
Julian, 30
Julius II, Pope, 249

Kleber, 465
Knights Templar, the, 153

La Bruyère, 386, 387
Lafayette, Marquis de, 429, 430, 449, 493, 497, 498, 500, 504, 522; German comment on, 500
La Fontaine, Jean de, 387
Lagny, 114
Lamartine, 504
Lancelot, 144, 153
Langres, 26
Languedoc, 217, 222, 300, 396
Lanson, quoted, 312, 316
La Rochefoucauld, Duke of, 405; house of, 445
La Rochelle, 300, 301, 338
Laplace, Pierre, 474
La Salle, 366
Lasteyrie, 120
Laud, 417
La Vallière, de, Louise, 370, 371
Lavisse, 433
Lavoisier, 465
Law, John, 411, 412
Lea, quoted, 164, 168
League of the Holy Trinity, 303, 307
League of Nations, the, 220
League to Enforce Peace, the, 81
Lebon, 464
Le Brun, 368, 421
Leclerc, 483, 488
Le Daim, Olivier, 241
Lefevre, Jacques d'Etaples, 259, 269, 270
Legitimists, the, 503
Leibnitz, 407
Leiden, University of, 27
Leipzig, battle of, 493
Lens, 352
l'Epée, de, Abbe, 420
Lescot, 264
Leszczynski, Stanislas, 413, 414
Ligurian Republic, the, 480, 491
Ligurians, the, 10, 11
Lilyites, the, 176
Limoges, 215
Literature; Provençal poetry, 9, 137; in Roman epoch, 32; poetry of Ausonius, 32-34; Latin literature saved by Benedictines, 123; translation of Testaments, of Latin *Physiologus*, 145; the *fabliaux*, 146, 147; rhymed biographies, 149; earliest French prose, 149, 150; Old French, 126; *Song of Roland*, 130-136; *Aucaussin and Nicolette*, 139-143; influence of rhymed romance on Chaucer, Dante, 144; Romances, of Antiquity, Breton, of Adventure, 138, 139; new forms in, 179-182; *Book of the Secrets of the World*, 183; *The Image of the World*, 184; *The Fountain of All Sciences*, 184; *Romance of the Rose; Imitation Reynard*, 183; *The Treasure of Brunetto Latini*, 184; the gentleman poets of the 15th century, 227; Villon: *Ballad of Dead Ladies, Brothers and Men; His Mother's Service to Our Lady*, 229-232; Memoirs of Commines, of Villehardouin 239; de Joinville, 239; Froissart, 240; Ronsard: *Poem on Truce of Vaucelles*, 255, 256, *Of His Lady's Old Age*, 311; du Bellay: *Defense of French Language*, etc., 266, *To Heavenly Beauty*, 311; during Renascence, 266, 267; the *Heptameron*, 272; Marot: *A Love Lesson*, 276, 277; *The Book of Martyrs*, 279; sixteenth century productions, 309-323; Rabelais: *Chronicles of the Great Giant Gargantua*, 312-314; Montaigne: *That to Study Phi-*

losophy is to *Learn* to *Die*, 322; St. Francis de Sales: *Introduction to the Devout Life*, 342; the Academie Française, Bossuet, 350, 352; *History of Variations of the Protestant Churches*, 406; Fénelon: *Maxims* of the *Saints*, *Telemachus*, 383; La Bruyère: *Characters or Manners and Morals of This Century*, 386; La Fontaine: *Tales*, *Fables*, *the Animals Ill of the Plague*, 388; Pascal: *Apology for the Christian Religion*, *Thoughts*, 394; d'Aubigne: *Tragiques*, 404; Balzac: *Prince*, *Letters*, 404; Boileau: *Poetic Art*, 405; Sevigné: *Letters*, 405; de Retz: *Memoirs*, 405; La Rochefoucauld: *Maxims*, 405; during 18th century, 434; Montesquieu: *Persian Letters*, *Spirit of the Laws*, 434; Rousseau: *La Nouvelle Heloise*, *The Social Contract*, 435; Voltaire, 436; political tracts of 18th century, 436
Loire River, the, 6, 225
Lombards, the, 174
L'Orme, de, 264
Lorraine, 93, 307, 495; Cardinal of, 281, 284; Duchy of, received by Stanislas, 414; ceded to German Empire, 511
Lorrainers, the, 102
Lotharingia, 64
Louis XII, 248, 249
Louis VI, 68, 99, 100-102
Louis VII, 103, 106-108, 223
Louis VIII, 99, 116, 118, 335-337
Louis IX, 99, 163-168
Louis XI, 234-239, 261
Louis XIII, 411
Louis XIV, 327; marriage of, to daughter of King of Spain, 353, 354; characteristics of, 357-359; councillors of, 359, 360; extravagance of, 361, 362; encouragement of industries and fine arts by, 363-369; pleasure in building of, 369, 370; mistresses of, 369-372; wars of, 373-380; statecraft of, 381-385, 391; bankruptcy of state caused by, 385; religious policy of, 392-399; rich constructions by, 421
Louis XV, succession to throne of, 411; characteristics of, 413; Madame du Barry, mistress of, 415; social, governmental reforms commenced in reign of, 419-422; death of, 418
Louis XVI, characteristics of, 423, 424; influence of Marie Antoinette upon, 424; parlements called by, 424, 425; controversy with Turgot, 427; Necker recalled by, 428; foreign policy of, 428; French assistance to American colonies in reign of, 429; financial straits of state under, 430; Estates General opened by, 431; sojourn in and escape from Tuileries of, 441; changed title of, 443; brought to trial as traitor, 457; art in reign of, 420, 422
Louis XVIII, 493-497
Louis Philippe, 498-502
Louisiana, 412, 417, 488, 489
Louvain, University of, 392
Louvre, the, 179
Lutetia, 30
Luther, Martin, 273, 260, 350
Lutheran Church, status of, under Napoleon, 489
Lyons, 23, 29, 30, 173, 463; Archbishop of, 503

Machiavelli, 154, 236; quoted, 247, 358
MacMahon, Marshal, 512
Madrid, Treaty of, 251
Magenta, battle of, 508
Magyars, the, 64, 69
Maillotins, the, 203
Maintenon, Madame de, 371, 372
Mallory, 131
Malplaquet, 378
Marat, 450-455
Marlborough, 378
Marcel, Etienne, 194-199
Marcellus II, Pope, 258
Marengo, battle of, 487
Margaret, daughter of Catherine de Medicis, 283, 296
Margaret, of Navarre, 272
Margrave, the, 53
Maria Theresa, of Austria, 414-416
Marie Antoinette, 424
Marly, 370
Marmande, 117
Marne, the, 521
Marot, Clement, 276
Marseilles, 10, 32, 463
Marsellaise, the, 448
Marshall, quoted, 477
Martin, Henri, quoted, 347
Martin IV, Pope, 169
Mary, Queen of Scots and of France, 281
Masséna, General, 481
Massif, Central (Mountains), 5

Massillon, Bishop of Clermont, 406
Maximilian, of Germany, 250
Maximilian, Archduke, the, 509
Mazarin, Jules, 327, 349, 351-356
Meaux, 276
Médicis, Catherine de, 283, 298, 299
Médicis, Marie de, 335
Médoc, 213, 519
Mercœur, Duke of, 306
Mercury, the, 346
Merovech, 45
Merovingians, the, 44-47
Metz, 253, 254
Meuse, 377
Mexico, 509
Milton, John, 404
Mirabeau, de, Count, 432, 433, 439, 450, 504
Mission, the Order of the, 341
Mississippi Company, the, 412
Mississippi River, the, 366, 379, 488
Mommsen, quoted, 25
Monasteries, 151, 152, 182
Moncontour, battle of, 290
Monluc, de, Blaise, 285
Monroe Doctrine, 509
Monroe, James, quoted, 466
Montagnards, the, 456, 460-466
Montaigne, 309, 319-323
Montauban, 301
Montespan, de, Marquise, the, 370, 371
Montesquieu, 434
Montmorency, family of, 282, 284, 445
Montpellier, 170; University of, 312
Montpensier, Duke of, 298
More, Sir Thomas, 259, 269
Morley, Sir John, quoted, 401
Morris, Gouverneur, quoted, 462
Morvillier, 299
Moscow, 493
Moselle River, the, 33, 34
Mount Saint Genevieve, 182
Mount Vernon, key of Bastille at, 439
Mullinger, quoted, 126
Munster, 275
Murat, 465, 483
Music, Conservatory of, founded, 474
Mussolini, 479

Nantes, Bishop of, 224, edict of, 327, 376, 396
Naples, 481, 491
Napoleon. See *Bonaparte*
"Napoleon legend," the, 506
Napoleon, Louis, 505
Napoleon III, 506-511
Napoleonic University, the, 489, 490
Narbonne, 32
National Assembly, the, 517
Navarino, battle of, 521
Navarre, king of, 197; Henry of, 301-303
Necker, 427, 428
Nelson, Lord, 481
Nemours, Duke of, 236
Netherlands, the, 295, 353, 495
Nevers, Duke of, 298
Newfoundland, 377
Newman, Cardinal, quoted, 122
New Orleans, 488
Nicæa, Council of, 44
Nice, annexation to France of, 508
Nile, the, battle of, 481
Nimeguen, peace of, 375
Nismes, 26, 32, 301
Normandy, 65; Duke of, 82, 93, 106
Nôtre Dame, 296; cathedral of, 172

Œcumenical Councils, the, 43
Oise, 197
Orange, William of, 374, 376
Oratorians, the, 341
Orleans, 203, 208; Duke of, 205, 206, 228, 229; Philip of, declared regent of France, 411; Philip of, son of Philip Equality, made King of France, 498, 499
Orleanists, the, 503
Otto, 112
Oudenarde, 379
Ovid, 148

Paine, Thomas, 457, 458
Painting, Academy of, 368; of Foucquet, 226
Palatinate, the, 377, 378
Palissy, memoirs of, 319
Paré, Ambrose, 319
Paris, early name and characteristics of, 30; cathedral of, 120; charms of, 126; population of, 13th century, 187; Duke of Burgundy favored by city of, 204, 205; classical buildings at, 263; siege of, by Henry of Navarre, 305; centre of fashion under Louis XIV, 406, 407; jealousy of influence of, 457; monuments to peaceful ideals in, 522-524; Archbishop of, 505; Parlement of, 217, 229, 278, 305, 354, 411, 425; University of, 126, 127, 173, 182, 211, 212, 220, 268
Paris, G., quoted, 130
Pariset, M., quoted, 445
Parkman, quoted, 417

Parlement of Paris. See *Paris*
Parthenopean Republic, the, 481
Partition, Treaty of, 378
Pascal, Blaise, 315, 393, 394
Pasquier, Etienne, 290
Pasteur, Louis, quoted, 465; benefactions of, 523; address at Milan of, 524
Pattison, quoted, 271
Pavia, battle of, 251
Pembroke, Earl of, 149
Perigord, 158;
Pershing, General, quoted, 525
Petrarch, 246, 259, 309
Pilles, Captain, 300
Pinel, Philippe, 475
Pippin II, 50
Pippin the Short, 51, 52
Pitt, 459
Philip I, 67, 96
Philip II, 99, 110-116
Philip III, 169
Philip IV, 169-173; 175, 176, 179
Philip of Valois, 183
Philip the Good, 207; library of, 227
Philip II of Spain, 303, 306
Plain, the (faction of Constitutional Convention), 456, 460
Plantagenet, Henry, 106
Plantagenet, Richard, 110
Pleiad, the, 266
Plutarch, 318
Poetry. See *Literature*
Poincaré, quoted, 9
Poissy, 286
Poitiers, 50, 58; battle of, 194, 195; University of, 226
Poland, 414, 491
Pompadour, de, Marquise, 415, 416
Pont-l'évêque, 519
Port Royal, 392, 393, 394
Portugal, 481, 492
Pragmatic Sanction, 221, 414
Praguerie, the, 233
Prescholastics, the, 88
Primaticcio, 263
Provençals, the, 9
Provins, 114
Prussia, 491, 492, 495, 511
Pyrenees, the, 169; Peace of, 353

Quebec, battle of, 417

Rabelais, 309-315
Racine, 367, 388
Rais, de, Baron, 223
Rambouillet, de, Marquise, the, 347
Rashdall, quoted, 122
Ratisbon, Truce of, 376, 377
Ravaillac, François, 334
Reformation, the, 245, 257, 267. See *Calvinism* and *Church.*
Remi, de, Philip. See *Beaumanovi*
Renascence, the, reasons for France's lack of leadership in, 245, 246; effect of, on France, 257-273
Republic, French, first, 470-484; the second, 502-511; the present, 511-525
Retz, de, Cardinal, 394, 405
Reuchlin, 259
Revolution, French, the, causes of, 433-438; fall of the Bastile, 438; march to Versailles, 440; Louis XVI returned to Paris, 440, 441; confiscation of Church property during, 446; the attack on the Tuileries, 448; Marat, the September massacres, 450, 451; the formal establishment of the Republic, 452
Revolution of 1830, 497, 498, 500
Rheims, 102, 203, 210; Archbishop of, 115, 219; Cathedral of, 120
Rhine, the, Confederation of, 491
Rhinegrave, the, 290
Rhone River, the, 6, 117
Richard I, of England, 155
Richard II, of England, 205
Richelieu, Cardinal, 327, 334; characteristics of, 335, 336; summary of achievements of, 337; activity in war of, 338; liking for pomp of, 339; repression of nobility by, 339; religious tolerance of, 340; certain lacks in administration, 345; news control by, 346; association with French Academy, 348; comment of, on French characteristics, 18
Richer, 88
Ring, the (fortress), 53
Ritter, 76
Robert the Strong, 66
Robert II, the Pious, 67
Robespierre, 446, 468; stand against atheism, attempt to introduce the religion of patriotism, 473
Rocroi, 351
Rohan, family of, 445
Roland, Madame, 456, 464, 469
Roland, Song of, 52
Rollo, 65
Roman Empire, establishment of, 10; conquest of Gaul, 9-18; government of, in Gaul, 21-27
Rome, sack of, 252; Academy of, 368
Ronsard, Pierre, 255, 256, 258, 266, 310

Rosebeque, battle of, 203
Rouen, 159, 187, 202, 215
Rousseau, 434-436, 439, 466
Roussillon, 224
Royalty, 350, 423
Russia, 481, 492, 493
Ryswick, peace of, 377

Sagnac, quoted, 442
St. André, Marshal, 284
St. Bartholomew, massacre of, 297-302
St. Bernard, 104-106, 126
Sainte Beuve, quoted, 405
St. Catherine, 212
St. Cloud, 502
St. Denis, Abbot of, 105
St. Dominic, 152
Saint Domingue, 488
St. Francis, 152; Order of, 182
St. Francis de Sales, 341, 342
St. Germain, 354
St. Helena, the island of, 494
St. Lawrence River, the, 366, 379
St. Louis (U. S.), 488
St. Margaret, 212
St. Michael, feast of, 131
St. Peter, altar of, 52
St. Pol, Constable of, 236
St. Quentin, battle of, 254
Saintsbury, quoted, 402
St. Vincent de Paul, 342
Sancerre, 301
Saracens, the, 52, 65, 69
Sardinia, King of, 456
Savoy, 508; Duke of, 256, 306, 508
Saxons, the, 55, 102
Saxony, King of, 492
Scaliger, Joseph, 270
Scarron, 371
Schism, the Great, 219
Scholasticism, 68, 87, 88, 123-125
Scholastics, 259
Schultz, Alwin, quoted, 156
Science, Academy of, 368; Pasteur's address on, 524
Scott, Sir Walter, quoted, 402
Sculpture, Academy of, 368
Sebastapol, 507
Sedan, battle of, 511
Seine River, the, 6, 190
Senlis, 215
Sens, Archbishop of, 175
Serres Olivier de, Book on Agriculture, 332
Serven, 436
Seven Years War, the, 416, 417
Sevigné, de, Marquise, 405
Sicily, 491
Silesia, 414
Silvester II, 88
Slavery, in 15th century, 224; in Saint Dominique, 488; abolished, 504
Sleidan, quoted, 240
"Smearers," the, 291
Society of Friends of the Blacks, 504
Society of the Friends of the Constitution, the, 437
Solferino, battle of, 508
Somme, the, 190, 197
Sorbonne, the, 315
Sorel, Agnes, 224
South Sea Bubble, the, 412
Spain, 488, 492
Spanish succession, war of, 378, 379
Spires, 377
Steele, 386
Stephens, Sir Fitz-James, quoted, 406
Strafford, 211
Strassburg, 375
Suabians, the, 102
Suffrage, in the Republics, 463, 471, 487, 496, 500, 503, 505
Suger, 101, 102, 105, 106
Sully, Duke, 329-331
Sweden, 353
Switzerland, 353
Syria, 481

Talbot, 211; assault at Castillon by, 213
Talleyrand, family of, 445
Tavannes, Marshal, 298
Temple, Order of the, 175
Terror, the; authorization of, 460; increased power of the Montagnards, 461, 463; Hébert, Madame Roland, Bailly, Lavoisier, put to death, 464, 465; Robespierre, 466, 467; Commune of Paris and Jacobin Clubs broken up; the Girondists recalled, 467; psychological causes of, 467-469
Testaments, the, translations of, 145
Theatre, religious roots of, 145, 146
Thiers, 510, 511; quoted, 512
Third Estate, the, 194, 195, 223, 431, 432, 443
Thirty Years' War, the, 257, 334
Thomas à Becket, 149
Thou, de, quoted, 255; 299
Tilley, quoted, 261
Toulon, 363, 463
Toulouse, 32, 108, 170; Count of, 93, 117
Tours, 242, 263
Transalpine Gaul, 11
Trianon, the, 370

Tricolour, the, 499
Trier, 32, 377
Triple Alliance, the, 373, 413
Triumvirate, the, 285
Troubadours, the, 137, 138, 144
Troyes, 26, 114; treaty of, 207
Truce of God, the, 81
Tuileries, the, 441, 482, 502; Robespierre's festival in, 473
Tunis, 167
Turenne, Marshal, 375
Turgot, 426, 427
Turkey, 481
Tuscany, Grand Duchy of, 488
Tyndale, 260

Ulm, 491
Unigenitus, the (papal bull), 395
United States, 476, 477, 478, 488, 489, 509
Universitas, the, 126
University of Paris. See *Paris*
Urban II, Pope, 92, 95
Ursulines, the, 341
Utrecht, Treaty of, 377

Valence, University of, 226
Valmy, battle of, 452
Ván Artevelde, Jacques, 189
Vassy, 287
Vauban, Marshal, 382, 398
Vendée, the, 459, 450, 463
Veneti, the, 16
Vercingetorix, 16, 17
Verdun, 63, 450, 520
Vergennes, 428
Verlaine, 232
Versailles, 361, 369, 370, 431
Vervins, Treaty of, 308, 327
Vezins, de, Sire, 290
Vienne, 32
Villars, Marshal, 377
Villehardouin, de, Geoffroi, 149
Villon, François, 229-232
Vincennes, 488
Virgil, 21, 32
Visigoths, the, 41
Viticulture, 5
Voltaire, 315, 435, 436, 439
Von Liebig, quoted, 465

War of the Public Good, 235
War of the Three Henrys, 303
Washington, George, 407, 416, 420, 429, 430, 442, 477, 478; eulogized by Napoleon, 487; statue of, in Paris, 522
Waterloo, 493
Wellington, 493
West Indies, the French, 365, 366
Westphalia, peace of, 254, 353
White Hoods, the, 160
Wordsworth, quoted, 213
Worms, 377

Ximenes, 259

Young, quoted, 419
Ypres, 203

Zola, 436
Zwingli, 260, 273

1288

944
V288

624.24

DATE DUE

MAR 7 '70	MAR 1 '70
APR 8 '70	MAY 14 '70

711.45

DATE DUE

944
V288

62424

AUTHOR
Dyke

TITLE
The Story of France

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER
DEC 8 '94	Antoine Smith Fr.	
	[redacted]	

DEMCO

LIVINGSTONE COLLEGE LIBRARY